

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT AND RELATED AUTHORITIES



HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 2260

AN ACT TO EXTEND UNTIL JULY 1, 1963, THE INDUCTION
PROVISIONS OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING
AND SERVICE ACT; THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF
AUGUST 3, 1950, SUSPENDING PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF
THE ARMED FORCES; AND THE DEPENDENTS
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

MARCH 3, 4, AND 5, 1959

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1959

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, *Chairman*

HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia
LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Texas
JOHN STENNIS, Mississippi
STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
CLAIR ENGLE, California
E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts
STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine
FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota
PRESCOTT BUSH, Connecticut
J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland

HARRY L. WINGATE, Jr., *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Statements of—	Page
Berry, Hon. Frank B., Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical)-----	184
*Blasingame, Dr. F.J.L., American Medical Association-----	204
*Blazier, Orpah S., secretary, Peace Committee, First Methodist Church, New Haven, Conn-----	220
*Bolitzer, Bernard, Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation-----	140
Brainard, Mrs. William E., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom-----	130
*Burke, Adm. Arleigh, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations-----	201
Butler, Miss Sally, director, General Federation of Women's Clubs---	16
*Carlton, Col. John T., executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States-----	210
Celeste, Richard, National Conference of Methodist Youth-----	114
Chilton, Dr. Thomas R., Engineering Manpower Commission of Joint Engineers-----	25
Coad, Hon. Merwin, U.S. Representative in Congress from State of Iowa-----	80
*Creig, Dr. Ralph E., chairman, Council on Legislation, the American Dental Association-----	205
Curtis, Hon. Thomas B., U.S. Representative in Congress from State of Missouri-----	2
Dickens, Col. Randolph C., Director, Reserve Affairs Policy Division, Office of Secretary of Defense-----	179
*Doyle, William, chairman, Military Affairs Committee, the American Legion-----	207
*Earle, Clifford, secretary, Department of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America-----	218
Estey, John C., Jr., associate dean, Amherst College, Massachusetts---	83
*Faugmeier, Robert A., the United Christian Missionary Society, Indianapolis, Ind-----	214
Finucane, Hon. Charles C., Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve)-----	152
Forest, Lester, American Humanist Association-----	108
*Freilicher, Frederick M., national chairman, Students for Democratic Action-----	222
*Freudenberger, Elmer M., acting national director of legislation, disabled American Veterans, Washington, D.C.-----	211
*Gill, William J., executive director, Catholic War Veterans-----	229
Gingerich, Melvin, managing editor of the Mennonite Encyclopedia, and director of research of the Mennonite Research Foundation----	49
Glattly, Dr. Harold W., National Medical Veterans Society-----	96
*Graham, Gordon, executive secretary, Students for Democratic Action	222
*Guild, Capt. Eugene R., U.S. Army, retired, Fighting Homefolks of Fighting Men-----	228
Harrington, James, representing the U.S. National Student Association	56
Harrison, Maj. Gen. William H., Jr., president, National Guard Association of the United States-----	75
*Haworth, Judge Byron, Five Years Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends-----	227
Hendrix, Col. Mike Y., American Veterans of World War II-----	93

*Statements submitted for the record ; did not appear in person.

Statements of—Continued	Page
Hershey, Lt. Gen. Lewis B., Director, Selective Service System-----	188
*Hopper, Merle E., national legislative director, Veterans of World War I-----	224
*King, Thomas H., Chairman, legislative committee, Military Order of the World Wars-----	213
Langton, Stuart, United Christian Youth Movement-----	121
*Levine, Murray S., New York, N.Y.-----Appendix	111
*McElroy, Hon. Neil H., Secretary of Defense-----	182
Meacham, Stewart, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.-----	105
Meyer, Hon. William H., U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Vermont-----	147
Meyerhoff, Dr. Howard A., Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission-----	17
*Muse, Mrs. Gladys G., Richmond, Va.-----	223
Neumann, Prof. William L., National Council Against Conscription--	118
*Newsom, Herschel D., National Grange, Washington, D.C.-----	212
*Pate, Gen. Randolph McC., Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps-----	203
*Peppiatt, Guy S., chairman, Committee on Research, National Association of Manufacturers-----	225
Ramsey, Rev. Duane H., Washington City Church of the Brethren----	31
*Reith, Rear Adm. George, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, secretary general, Order of World Wars, Washington, D.C.-----	213
*Riley, George D., legislative representative of American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations-----	10
Schmidt, Dr. J. Raymond, National Civic League, Washington, D.C.--	54
*Secrest, James D., executive vice president, Electronic Industries Association, Washington, D.C.-----	214
*Siteman, Stephen, executive secretary, Post War World Council, New York, N.Y.-----	220
Streeter, Mrs. Wallace N., Methodist Church Board of Missions-----	112
*Taylor, Gen. Maxwell D., Chief of Staff, U.S. Army-----	199
Thomas, Rev. John W., National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America-----	11
Thomas, Norman, Socialist Party—Social Democratic Federation----	140
*Wallace, Clayton M., executive director, National Temperance League--	219
Weaver, Rev. E. Paul, Indiana Council of Churches, Mexico, Ind.---	43
Weitzer, Bernard, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.-----	99
Whatley, David, Bethesda, Md.-----	143
*White, Gen. Thomas D., Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force-----	202
Will, Herman, Jr., representing the Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church-----	101
Wilson, E. Raymond, executive secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation-----	34
Wolf, Hon. Leonard G., U.S. Representative in Congress from State of Iowa-----	63
Wool, Harold, Analysis Division, Office of Secretary of Defense----	174

*Statements submitted for the record ; did not appear in person.

ORGANIZATIONS

	Page
*American Dental Association.....	205
*American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.....	10
*American Friends Service Committee, Inc.....	105
American Humanist Association.....	108
*American Legion.....	207
*American Medical Association.....	204
American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS).....	94
Amherst College, Massachusetts.....	83
*Catholic War Veterans.....	229
*Disabled American Veterans.....	211
*Electronic Industries Association.....	214
Engineering Manpower Commission of Joint Engineers.....	25
*Fighting Homefolks of Fighting Men, Glenwood Springs, Colo.....	228
*First Methodist Church Peace Committee, New Haven, Conn.....	220
Friends Committee on National Legislation.....	34
*Five Years Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers).....	227
General Federation of Women's Clubs.....	16
Indiana Council of Churches.....	43
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.....	99
Mennonite Research Foundation.....	49
Methodist Church Board of Missions.....	112
Methodist Church Board of World Peace.....	101
*Military Order of the World Wars.....	213
*National Association of Manufacturers.....	225
National Civic League.....	54
National Conference of Methodist Youth.....	114
National Council Against Conscription.....	118
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.....	11
*National Grange.....	212
National Guard Association of the United States.....	75
National Medical Veterans Society.....	96
*National Temperance League, Inc.....	219
*Post War World Council.....	220
*Reserve Officers Association of the United States.....	210
Scientific Manpower Commission.....	17
Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation.....	140
*Students for Democratic Action.....	222
United Christian Youth Movement.....	121
*United Christian Missionary Society.....	214
*United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Board of Christian Education.....	218
U.S. National Student Association.....	56
*Veterans of World War I.....	224
Washington City Church of the Brethren.....	31
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.....	130

*Statements inserted for the record ; did not appear.

DRAFT EXTENSION

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1959

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m. in room 212, Senate Office Building.

Present: Senators Russell (presiding), Stennis, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Cannon, Saltonstall, Smith, Case, and Bush.

Also present: Messrs. Darden and Wingate, of the committee staff.

Chairman RUSSELL. The bill under consideration this morning is H.R. 2260, a Department of Defense proposal that would extend for 4 years, from July 1, 1959 through July 1, 1963, the authority (1) to induct persons into the Armed Forces, (2) to issue selective calls for physicians, dentists, and allied specialists, (3) to suspend the limitation on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces, and (4) to pay allowances under the Dependents Assistance Act.

A copy of the bill will be printed in the record at this point.
(H.R. 2260 is as follows:)

[H.R. 2260, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

Passed the House of Representatives February 5, 1959.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk*.

Chairman RUSSELL. Ordinarily, we would start the hearings by having testimony from officials of the Department of Defense. In this instance, however, it seems desirable to hear first the nongovernmental witnesses. This arrangement will permit us to consider opposing arguments when the Defense witnesses appear.

Of course, this is not to say that all the witnesses for today and tomorrow oppose the bill. From the requests to testify, it is not always possible to foretell the views of an organization or other wit-

ness. Thus it is obvious that the list of witnesses for today and tomorrow intersperses different viewpoints.

Because of the large number of witnesses, I hope we may proceed as expeditiously as is consistent with an understanding of the views of the organizational person testifying and that the witnesses will cooperate in this objective.

The first witness this morning is Congressman Curtis, of Missouri.

Congressman, we are delighted to have you with us, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Before proceeding, however, I think it might be well if I identified some of my background in this area.

First, I had approximately 4 years service in the U.S. Navy during World War II. I have followed quite closely many of the problems we have in education today. I am a trustee of Dartmouth College, a member of the board of overseers of the Thayer Engineering College, a member of the board of overseers of the Tuck School of Business. I was for many years a member of the Board of Law Examiners of the State of Missouri. I have followed very closely the problems of vocational education. I, after my tour of duty in the Navy, represented for many years the naval officers from the ranks, who were composed of primarily technicians—

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you mind a personal question, Congressman?

Mr. CURTIS. Go right ahead, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. How is it that you, living in Missouri, happened to get on the board of Dartmouth and Tufts?

Mr. CURTIS. That was because of a series of circumstances that led me to go to that college in my undergraduate days, and it is strange for a Missourian to go that far away to school, but I think I prospered by it.

Chairman RUSSELL. You said Tufts?

Mr. CURTIS. No. Tuck School of Business. I was a member of the Bonner subcommittee in the 82d Congress which went into the field of military procurement, and I was a co-author, along with Congressman McCormack, of what over in the House side at any rate was called the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Unification Act of last year.

I have followed as closely as I can, and debated each time these bills have come up, in regard to the usage of manpower, whether it had to do with the Draft Act, UMC, or the Reserve Act; and finally, I have four sons who will be faced with this problem.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubt it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, or training. It is theoretically a Draft Act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislation birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first April 3, 1951, pages 3220-3222 of the Congressional Record; April 12, 1951, pages 3786-3787; February 29, 1952, pages 1674-1678; May 17, 1955, pages 6497-6498, and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also incidentally does not live up to its title.

I quote:

Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose; i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that "every American boy should have military training." I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a "training" bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) We would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close order military drill skills indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the military establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators' school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operators or not and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious:

1. You don't have a very good bulldozer operator.
2. After the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer—likely not—so the skill is lost (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills).
3. The cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable.
4. The talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized.

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is born out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records, the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happens to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points, I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points.

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a volunteer.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't understand that sentence.

Mr. CURTIS. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a volunteer.

The Marine Corps, for example, and the Navy up until about November 1942, in World War II, operated on a volunteer basis, acquiring their personnel through enlistment instead of by draft because the theory being that if you get a man coming in under his own volition, whatever the incentives are, he operates better and the system can utilize him more.

Chairman RUSSELL. You say "an enlistee is considerably more valuable than a volunteer."

That is the word—

Mr. CURTIS. This was a mistake in my print, a draftee, I beg your pardon. I understand your confusion and my confusion too. That is a typographical error there, Mr. Chairman, yes.

An enlistee is considerably more important than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers won't work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves.

To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it doesn't work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90 percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills.

Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

The civilian educational system including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90 percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors, and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90 percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A-1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations—the cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90 percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice, set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some people have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the educational system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

This committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. You presented a very interesting approach to this troublesome problem, Congressman.

Of course such a study as you indicate would require some highly skilled technicians of its own.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, it would.

Chairman RUSSELL. And also they would require them in the services.

Mr. CURTIS. Fortunately, if I may say, these studies have been going on to some extent, and I know the chairman is aware of the Columbia Institute's studying the usages of military manpower, and many of the books they have published over the past few years bear directly on this subject.

Dr. Ginsberg, who is head of that, can testify to a great deal of the matters I have advanced here.

The tragedy, in my judgment, is—each time our draft law or the UMT or Reserve Act comes up, these matters are not gone into. It has never been resolved in the 8 or 9 years now that I have been a Congressman, and debated on these matters and studied them myself.

Chairman RUSSELL. You, of course, are well aware that we had a Commission, I think it was the National Security Training Commission, to study this whole problem and to make recommendations. So far as I know, they did not go into this aspect of it in any detail.

Mr. CURTIS. That Commission, if I may say so, and I have said so on the floor of the House, and my remarks were not challenged nor can they be, was, in my judgment, a disgrace. That Commission would not even allow its testimony, the testimony of the witnesses, to be made public so that none of us in the Congress were able to even evaluate what this Commission had studied.

I have laid these out in the remarks, and the quotations I have given you in the Congressional Record when I detailed the problem that we have.

Furthermore, I would say this, that I do not believe an executive commission is the proper technique for getting into those things. I think a congressional committee such as this committee serves that purpose much more ably.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, of course in the last analysis it would have to be done in this kind of a committee, but very often the studies are made by the commissions, even though appointed without benefit of statute, and are very helpful to the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. If they would make available the basis upon which they reached their conclusion; yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any further questions?

Senator ENGLE. May I ask, sir?

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Engle.

Senator ENGLE. I am glad to see my colleague from the House over here.

Mr. CURTIS. Glad to see you, Senator.

Senator ENGLE. He has made a very interesting statement.

I got a letter not so long ago from a boy down in Texas, a well-educated fellow sitting down there in a training camp vegetating and wasting his time and thoroughly frustrated by the whole business. He wanted me to do something about it.

I did not know any way to do anything about it.

Now, of course the proposal, Congressman, which you advocate would be a very radical change.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; it would.

Senator ENGLE. And it would require some time. The immediate problem, of course, is to keep your armed services up to whatever the necessary levels are.

What would you do if you put your system in and somehow we missed the target? We didn't create quite enough.

As I understand it, you would have a very large proportion, you mentioned up to 90 percent, of the armed services really in civilian capacity.

Mr. CURTIS. My point is, that is the kind of activity they are engaged in now, repairing planes, automobiles, maintenance, the operation of technical equipment which is not on the front line, but may I say this—my real plea to the committee is the study—and I would say that frankly until you can evaluate the proposals I have made, and other proposals, I think that you would have to probably extend the draft.

I know, for example, the Reserve program and the National Guard program right now are using the crutch of the draft in order to fill their billets and so the Military Establishment would agree.

But I suggest it is a crutch and it is a damaging thing, damaging the long-range plan to continue to rely on it. My advice would be, if this committee saw fit, to go into this study, and that if you realized, after engaging in it for a couple of months that you could not come forward with a program you are satisfied with that would take care of adequate defense, to continue the draft law for another year until you can get this other program moving.

But, this is the point that I have been trying to make, for 9 years, and each year it comes along, still we have not done what I regard as a very basic study. And in the meantime some of the very things I have warned about, not just myself and not because I say it, the important thing is whether the damage that is going to be done to our educational system and your shortage of technicians and of the skills and workmen that we need to do things in these areas is now apparent so that I have made the charge. I think I can back it up if there is any one single thing, that it has fouled up, that is our educational system in this country. The thing that has done it has been the manner in which the draft law has been used. It has interfered with the education of every American boy in this country, whether he was drafted or not. The threat was over him and he had his educational program interfered with, and we know that is true.

Now, whether or not it is necessary and has to be that way is the question that should be examined. I don't think it does have to be. I think we can provide the manpower that the military needs and continue with a sound educational program at the same time, in fact I think the two go together if we will analyze it.

Senator ENGLE. You do not have a bill in preparation now, you advocate a study?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Senator ENGLE. And instead of extending the law 4 years, as the bill requires, you would extend it for 1 or 2 years, is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. I would think this, that there is enough information available from the people that have studied this, I suggest that one commission, the Columbia Manpower Committee, that this committee with its vast experience over the years could come up in 2 months with an adequate bill for the manpower problem and my answer is that I think you could come up.

However, I can only give suggestions. I would not act upon the things I have said. Let me say to the gentleman, without having the technical people in the Military Establishment come in and subject themselves to cross-examination on these points, ask them one thing—why, when the Reserve programs have not worked, didn't they come before the committees and point out in detail why they were not working? The reason they can't point out, they didn't come out and look in St. Louis, Mo.; we never had admirals or generals come out there to find out what was wrong with our Reserve program. They didn't care enough about it. They are not trying to make it work, and as soon as you find out that they don't know why they are not working, you can take the next step from there.

I must say this, that this is too serious, gentlemen, to go ahead in ignorance, which I think our committee did on the House side with 7 hours of the hearing.

Senator ENGLE. Did you testify before the House committee?

Mr. CURTIS. No. Because I didn't learn of it—I was waiting to, and the hearing had been completed before I had a chance, but I had sent up word that I wanted to testify but they were in and out so fast that I didn't have a chance.

Senator ENGLE. You would have two things: You would have to arrange to train the 90 percent through the established educational system, and secondly you would have to set up some incentive for the so-called combat service people which would be high enough to get the number you needed, otherwise you would have to draft them, would you not?

Mr. CURTIS. Your technicians are available, your technical schools are available, and if you examine into it—I can give you one example—we have Scott Air Force Base right across from my district in St. Louis, which used to be the top Air Force training command. Go over there and you will find that they duplicated the civilian-type vocational educational classrooms with an identical machinery, competing for the same teaching personnel and so forth.

I say if we merely take an inventory now into our situation we will find that these skills are largely available. They can be matched. There are schools that continue turning these out more and more, and wherever there is a shortage of a certain skill in our society, we can very easily implement it through our educational system, our vocational system.

Now, we need information which I think is largely available, if this committee will gather it together.

Senator ENGLE. I am not so sure we will ever be able to eliminate the draft altogether in the combat area.

I observe your reference to the Military Justice Code.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Senator ENGLE. I might say to the gentleman that if the rest of his statement is as accurate as that one is, he is right on the beam.

Mr. CURTIS. Thank you.

Senator ENGLE. I made a little study on that, and my judgment was and I submitted it over at the Pentagon, that the new Military Justice Code would not operate under conditions of full mobilization, there would not be enough lawyers in the country to make it work.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say to the gentleman, I don't think it worked

in the Korean war, and an analysis of actually how they handled the situation showed that they reverted back to what I call the common law type military justice that we used to have, because it obviously was inapplicable for combat conditions.

But, I hope the gentlemen will read the other points in here. These are not the result of momentary thinking, they are the result of thinking over a period of many, many years and discussing it with military leaders.

In my statement on this one point, Adm. Ben Moreell, who set up the Seabee procurement system would be very valuable really because what I am proposing here is an extension of the Seabee formula to modern warfare because we are dealing largely with the needed technical skills that are almost completely available in the civilian society.

Senator ENGLE. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Congressman. We are glad to get the benefit of your thinking.

Mr. CURTIS. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Our next witness listed is Mr. George D. Riley, who is known to all the members of this committee. He represents the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. Riley has asked that his statement with respect to this bill be printed in the record, and he will not appear personally this morning.

His statement will appear in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE D. RILEY, AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE

The AFL-CIO has been a vigorous supporter of the Selective Service Act. Ever since the defense period preceding World War II, we have recognized the necessity of requiring young men to enter military service in defense of their country.

Congress is facing the difficult task of deciding whether and under what circumstances the Selective Service Act should be continued. We are fully mindful of the importance of this legislation.

The AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions are very directly affected by the decision Congress makes on this issue. Many of our members are young people who are eligible for military service under the law. Moreover, the entire operation of the Selective Service System has very important implications for employer-employee relations since the draft often acts as a deterrent to the hiring of young people in the draft-eligible age. Moreover, the AFL-CIO is directly concerned with the full utilization of available manpower resources and the effect of selective service on the civilian labor force.

Consequently, we have tried to examine very carefully the problem of compulsory military service. We are mindful of some of the questions that have been raised by many people, including our members, regarding operation of the present law. We have talked to officials in the Defense Department and Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. We have examined figures and statistics on the military manpower pool.

We have come to the following conclusions:

1. THE DRAFT SHOULD BE CONTINUED

The Congress has made military service somewhat more attractive by increasing the pay of those who have served more than 2 years, by installing a special incentive program, and has offered other benefits to those on active duty.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the Armed Forces are not attracting sufficient volunteers to fulfill our defense needs. Thus in order to meet our international commitments and to insure our own defense, continuation of the draft is necessary. The cold war which continues to threaten our basic freedoms demands we remain strong. Our allies are looking to see if the United States is going to maintain its military forces. If selective service is not continued, they may well view this as a sign that they, too, can relax their own military commitments. Only a continuation of the draft will insure the necessary strength of our Armed Forces and maintenance of effective fighting forces among our allies. We firmly support extension of the Selective Service Act.

2. RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

In considering extension of obligatory service, we believe it proper to consider certain rights which have been given to servicemen for obligatory service. Though the question is not under consideration at present, we feel that an extension of certain GI privileges to peacetime veterans is a part of the whole picture.

Because of the hardships of military service, some of the privileges of service, i.e., education and training benefits, GI loans, and life insurance benefits which have been dropped in recent years should be restored to those who perform military service in the cold war.

Numerous bills have been introduced covering part of these recommendations, but we feel that it is necessary to emphasize these benefits because they are a concomitant right to the obligations imposed by the Selective Service Act.

3. DISCHARGE AND REEMPLOYMENT

With regard to the individual's reemployment rights, we recommend that the phrase "under honorable conditions" be stricken from section 9(g) (1) and (2) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. The inclusion of this phrase has had the effect of denying reemployment rights to individual inductees who either have committed offenses such as insubordination or a.w.o.l., which are not civilian crimes, or who already have made restitution for their negligence in the military by undergoing appropriate military penalties.

Hence, we are of the view that the requirement of an honorable discharge should not be imposed on any individual with service in the Armed Forces who desires to regain his civilian employment.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Dr. John W. Thomas, representing the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

Dr. Thomas, have a seat, please sir.

STATEMENT OF REV. JOHN W. THOMAS, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.

Dr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am executive secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the American Baptist Convention.

By your courtesy, I am pleased to testify here on behalf of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and upon the express authorization of its responsible officers on the basis of official policies. The National Council of Churches is composed of 32 Protestant and Orthodox denominations with over 38 million members. I do not presume to speak for every individual member, but I present the official positions of the National Council of Churches on matters related to proposed extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. These positions are arrived at by careful study and deliberation by representatives of the constituent denominations.

I next deal with—

THE GENERAL POSITION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ON
UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Our general position on universal military training is this: On the basis of Christian concern and in keeping with the actions of many of our constituent bodies we are opposed to permanent universal military training and therefore must register our opposition to extension of induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

THE CHURCHES SUPPORT NATIONAL DEFENSE BUT OPPOSE EXCESSIVE
MILITARISM

The National Council of Churches has often expressed its concern for the continued security of our Nation, and acknowledges the need for adequate defense measures in the light of international threats in recent years. The churches in our constituency, generally are in agreement with our country's traditional view that military force is however, a last resort, to be used against overt attack and to defend ourselves and our allies under treaty obligations. The churches have been alive to the danger which is inherent in an overwhelming emphasis on defense; that is, our Nation, taking what seems to be the necessary actions to prepare ourselves for an attack from without, could sacrifice and surrender to military expediency some of the very values we are making an effort to defend. For this reason, the National Council of Churches gives its full support to positive programs aimed at solving the problems which have divided our world into warring camps, to programs which make for stability, justice, freedom, and peace for all nations, including our own.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PERSONAL AND NATIONAL EFFECTS OF UNIVERSAL
MILITARY TRAINING

While holding to the need for adequate national defense, the churches have expressed serious doubts and fears concerning a conscription program involving millions of young men. Technical questions have been raised, as for example, the potential worth of a military force composed of men who have had such short elementary training in the face of the skilled personnel demands of modern, increasingly complex weapons systems (questions initiated by military experts rather than church leaders). But the churches are more concerned about and have special competence in the moral and spiritual issues. For instance, how serious is the psychological impact such widespread indoctrination in military thinking has on the individuals who undergo it and their consequent effect on our Nation as a whole? The church must be concerned with the effect military training has on those whose education is interrupted, whose plans are thrown awry, whose sense of values is warped by the artificial life one is forced to live under normal conditions of military life. The church is also concerned with the feelings which are brought to many young men that they can make no real plans as to further education or setting goals in life until the military obligation is fulfilled. To say that these concerns can be discounted because your men of draft age fully understand the nature of what they are being called to do,

requires of this group a maturity which is far from common, if ever attained during those formative years.

The Christian church encourages incentives for freedom of conscience, freedom of vocational choice, and the integrity of family life. Universal military conscription seriously encroaches on all three of these fundamental values.

There are serious questions which must be asked about the religious and moral climate indigenous to military life. The church has always taught that a wholesome moral life is better attained in normal civilian surroundings where the influences of home and church are more easily brought to bear.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL EFFECTS OF MILITARY TRAINING

Compulsory military service makes it inevitable that thousands of our young men will be indoctrinated with a sense of over suspicion and hostility to every move made by those who are classed as our enemies. This suspicion can make it impossible for a vast number of our people to recognize a peaceful overture, even when one is made. By constantly looking for warlike actions on the part of those who oppose us, we help to create the conditions which would make war more likely. Already there is a trend toward militarization of the minds of our people and of the conduct of our foreign policy which constituent communions of the National Council of Churches have gone on record to warn against and to deplore.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RELATIVE VALUE OF VARIOUS NATIONAL EXPENDITURES

The churches are also concerned with the moral questions involved in the expenditure of so vast a part of our Nation's economy on the Defense Establishment. The Christian faith demands an enlightened concern about the use of our material blessings, and as citizens of a great Nation, Christians in this country have concerns about the way the Federal Government expends its moneys. Therefore, the question must be raised: Are there not better ways these funds might be spent—ways which would bring us nearer to a peaceful world and allow us to have, along with an adequate defense, the ability to show a more helpful and peaceful posture to the rest of the world, thus reducing international tensions and at the same time winning increasing respect and support among other peoples in the world.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING IS NOT IN ACCORD WITH OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

I reiterate, the National Council of Churches has consistently supported the policies of the United States to build adequate strength to repel possible aggression against itself or its allies. Such strength, we understand, includes military power as well as moral character, sound economic structure, and good political relationships. It would be another, and quite different thing for the churches to support the conscription of each succeeding generation of the Nation's youth for a program of universal military training. This, the churches have opposed. The churches have said, it is not in accord with our heritage

as a free nation under God, permanently to recruit our youth under the banners of the military. To do this would be to take a long step in the direction of a garrison state, and then some alternative studies.

ALTERNATIVE COURSES TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ARE COMMENDED

Recent military manpower studies—reference is made to the Cordiner report and studies by the Fund for the Republic—have proposed alternatives to a universal conscription program which seem to offer the possibility for a greater defensive strength than we now have with the expenditure of no more and perhaps even less of our Nation's economy for purely military purposes. We would commend such an approach to this committee for general consideration as alternatives to the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

If we are to live in a world of peace it is imperative that our country take more initiative in so ordering our domestic life and international relations that it will become evident to those other nations who look on us with suspicion and fear that we share in any genuine desire for peace with justice and freedom. It is our earnest prayer that to each member of this committee, and to the Senate, there be vouchsafed such measure of divine wisdom as will enable the Congress to reach a decision most nearly in accord with God's will for our beloved country and the world.

POLICY STATEMENTS BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. Chairman, the texts of two policy statements of the National Council of Churches on universal military training are attached to my statement. I will not impose upon the committee's time by reading them but do commend them to your attention and request that they be incorporated with my statement in the record.

Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Very well. That will appear in the record. (The two policy statements referred to are as follows:)

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

A statement adopted by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., January 30, 1952

With the view to meeting the military requirements of our Nation during the current period of international tension, the Congress has extended to 1955 the drafting of men for the Armed Forces. The period of military service has been lengthened from 21 to 24 months and the ceiling on numbers raised from 3½ to 5 million men. If events that cannot now be foreseen should make necessary the further strengthening of the Nation's Armed Forces this end can be accomplished by congressional action in the light of conditions then prevailing. The National Council of Churches, however much it may deplore the circumstances that have required this stepping up of our Military Establishment, acknowledges the need of and supports adequate defense measures.

With its position on the issue of national security thus stated, the National Council of Churches affirms its opposition to permanent universal military training. This action is in line with the views of many of our constituent communions which over a period of years have consistently opposed universal military training.¹ It seems clear, that the effort to establish a system of

¹ These communions include the following: American Baptist Convention, Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, Church of the Brethren, Congressional-Christian Churches, Disciples of Christ, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Evangelical United Brethren Church, Friends Five Years Meeting, Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity, Methodist Church, and Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. In addition, the Board of Social Missions of the United Lutheran Church has taken similar action.

permanent universal military training will meet with widespread opposition within our churches for religious and moral reasons and to the end that our traditional democratic institutions may be preserved.

We believe it is one thing to acknowledge the necessity of drafting men for a limited period to meet a specific international emergency. It is another, and quite different thing for the churches to support the conscription of each succeeding generation of the Nation's youth for a program of universal military training. It is not in accord with our heritage as a free Nation under God, permanently to recruit our youth under the banners of the military. To do this would be to take a long step in the direction of a garrison state.

We are mindful of the grave responsibilities with which our Congress is confronted during these difficult days. The decision which it is required to make respecting universal military training will be far-reaching consequences for the people of other lands as well as our own. It is our earnest prayer that to each member of the House and Senate there may be vouchsafed such measure of divine wisdom as will enable the Congress to reach a decision in accord with God's will for our beloved country.

PERMANENT UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

A statement adopted by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., March 3, 1955

Vote: For, 72; against, 3; abstentions, 2.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., on January 30, 1952, after recording its concern for national security, and acknowledging the need for adequate defense measures in the light of circumstances then existing, affirmed its opposition to permanent universal military training. That action was in line with the views of many of its constituent communions, recorded over a period of years.

We are now in a situation in which it is most important that the churches uphold the hands of leaders who are seeking to reduce tensions among the nations.

In this situation legislation is being proposed the probable effect of which, within the Nation, is a matter of widespread uncertainty.

We therefore urge our constituent churches to study current legislative proposals having to do with military training, with consideration both of their international and domestic significance.

The National Council of Churches reserving judgment as to specific measures currently under consideration, reaffirms its opposition to permanent universal military training.

Chairman RUSSELL. I can assure you, I think, Dr. Thomas, that every Member of the Congress can conceive a way that would be more desirable to spend the \$40 billion we spend on defense annually, when you look at just the matter of what is going to benefit the people in your district directly. None of us view with enthusiasm the extension of selective service, but we have not yet been able to evolve any way to preserve this country and prevent the world from falling into the clutches of the godless forces of the men in the Kremlin without having an adequate defense system.

Any questions from Dr. Thomas?

(No response.)

Chairman RUSSELL. If not, we thank you, Doctor. We are glad to have heard from you.

The next witness is a representative of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Their views will be presented by Miss Sally Butler.

Come around, Miss Butler, please.

STATEMENT OF MISS SALLY BUTLER, DIRECTOR, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

MISS BUTLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first let us say that it is a privilege to come here. I am making a very, very brief statement based on resolutions passed by our convention, and I would like to say that this resolution, passed by that convention body, is first considered by a committee, then sent from the member club or member State, considered by the committee and put in proper form, sent back to each State for them to act upon before the national convention, so any action that they have taken is not a rush action, but it is premeditated and they have given it serious thought.

So, with that in mind, I would like to say to you that I am Sally Butler, the legislative director, and am here representing our president, Miss Chloe Gifford.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has always been concerned about adequate national security. With the situation existing today, women realize it would be folly to discontinue the selective service program which gives the boys entering the armed services the opportunity to be most effective in the areas of their greatest abilities; it would seem to us that failure to extend this act under the Universal Military Training and Service Act would weaken the United States defenses at this time when it is so evident we need strength.

We have expressed our conviction, by convention action, that the Government of the United States has the responsibility to maintain its military forces in adequate quality and numbers to permit it to meet fully its obligations. Believing this to be necessary for the defense and security of our country we submit the following resolution as a basis for this statement.

And, I would like to call to your attention the name of the resolution: "Maintenance of Strong United States Armed Forces." and I would like to tell you, in convention in 1914, this Federation of Women's Clubs, and incidentally it was chartered—the club was chartered by the Congress of the United States about 75 years ago—and in 1924 they passed a resolution, which last year, in 1958, in convention, we amended, and this is the amended resolution:

Whereas the deterrence of wars, and achieving victory in case wars are forced upon us, are basic national objectives demanding an ever-ready system of adequate forces in all branches of the military service; and

Whereas it is obvious that the conditions of future warfare will render impossible systems of deliberate mobilization and unhurried training after an emergency situation has developed; and

Whereas it is the moral responsibility of the people and the Government of the United States to provide all members of the military services every protection which physical fitness and adequate training in military science can give them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs declares its conviction that this Nation should maintain its military forces in adequate quality and numbers: in strength and equipment; and in organization and development so as to permit it to meet fully its obligation:

1. To deter war in all forms;
2. To achieve victory in waging either atomic or nonatomic war should such be forced upon us; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs strongly supports the establishment of incentives in salary schedules, working and living conditions, which will make careers in the armed services of the United States sufficiently attractive to retain highly trained and efficient personnel within those services.

And that is the end of the resolution.

We believe that it is vitally necessary for our country's welfare to keep our defenses strong at this time and urge the 86th Congress to extend the induction authority under Universal Military Training and Service Act to July 1, 1963.

Now, we believe that, as an organization, this body of men, our Congress, have the ability to, and the desire to do what is best for our country; and we believe that, with the evidence as presented to them, they are going to give us the protection that is necessary.

We believe that in a certain type of what we call a way of life, but we realize, too, that conditions have changed situations, and the conditions are such today that we have to be ready and prepared for any emergency that might come.

I would like to say, further, that personally as a representative of women's clubs I have traveled abroad, and I have seen there many white crosses, and I know women that are Gold Star Mothers that perhaps would not have been, had all our boys had adequate training and been qualified and ready to accept the responsibility that we thrust upon them when war comes, and they must respond.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, Miss Butler, I certainly commend the forthrightness of your statement. No one could misunderstand it, and on behalf of the Congress I appreciate your expression of confidence in the Congress.

Are there any questions for Miss Butler?

(No response.)

Chairman RUSSELL. If not, thank you very much for your appearance here.

Miss BUTLER. Thank you, sir, for the privilege.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, who represents the Scientific Manpower Commission.

STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD A. MEYERHOFF, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER COMMISSION

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Howard A. Meyerhoff. I am a geologist and still practice my profession, but for the past 6 years I have also served as executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission. This statement is being made on behalf of the commission, which is a private organization, founded in 1953 by the major scientific groups of the Nation. These groups embrace virtually all agricultural scientists, astronomers, biologists, chemists, earth scientists, mathematicians, physicists, and psychologists practicing in the clinical and experimental fields. Each of the 10 sponsoring scientific organizations nominates 2 of its members to represent it, thus giving the Scientific Manpower Commission a total membership of 20. The roster of members in 1958 is appended in a brochure attached to this statement. The commission was established by these scientific groups to deal with manpower problems common to them all; hence it acts in behalf of the 200,000 scientists who are members of these 10 scientific groups. It does not pretend to be their sole spokesman or to represent the views of all of them, but I think it safe to say that it represents the opinions of a vast majority of the scientists of the Nation.

In behalf of my fellow Commissioners, I wish to express our appreciation of the invitation that has been given to us to appear before

this committee once again to present our views, and the results of our experience in the specialized manpower field since I testified on H.R. 3005 in the 84th Congress, on June 9, 1955. Appended to the copy of this statement that I am leaving with Mr. Wingate is a copy of the statement I presented 4 years ago when the extension of the Draft Act was also under consideration. In rereading the remarks I made before this committee at that time, I was agreeably surprised in seeing how prophetic and accurate that document has proved to be. I was even tempted to lift part of it and incorporate it in the testimony I am submitting today, for much of it still applies, with even greater force than it did in the year 1955. I will, however, refrain from burdening you with repetition, because much has happened in these 4 years that bears upon the legislation under consideration.

First, let me say that the Scientific Manpower Commission firmly believes that the power granted to the Selective Service System to induct young men must be extended. We further believe a 4-year extension is to be preferred over a 2-year extension. We do urge, however, that H.R. 2260 be amended so as to broaden the powers of the Selective Service System and to enable it, by statutory provision, to select men with critically needed skills for assignment to civilian activities that are essential to the national welfare and security. May I set forth the reasons for this proposed amendment.

Since June 1955, and specifically since October 4, 1957, we have had forcibly brought home to us the fact that we are engaged in an all-out struggle. From a military standpoint it is a cold war, but from a technological standpoint it is a hot war. In recognition of this fact the administration has appointed a Science Advisory Committee and a Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. A panel of the Science Advisory Committee has recently urged the creation of a Federal Council for Science and Technology. Although this committee is fully aware of the fact that science and technology (or engineering, as we prefer to call it) are not abstractions, but rather the aggregate of the brainpower that resides in individual scientists and engineers, it nonetheless disclaims any responsibility for manpower. The only executive agency charged with some responsibility for civilian manpower requirements is the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Even here, in the recent reorganization of that agency, manpower problems and responsibilities were dropped from a second to a third echelon of administrative responsibility. From the record it would appear that only the Department of Defense and its branches appreciate the significance of manpower as such, but, unfortunately, there is little appreciation in this quarter of the equally important civilian requirements for highly trained personnel.

Upon General Hershey and his Selective Service organization has been placed the responsibility for meeting the needs of the armed services, but in his position he has observed the changing requirements and, in somewhat guarded language, has described them in a brilliant editorial in the monthly publication, *Selective Service*. I quote:

The Selective Service System faces the necessity of remaining ready at all times to furnish men in the numbers needed. The current operation is not the ideal method to maintain readiness for all-out effort. It is our task to oper-

ate a low-call, highly selective process, while at the same time retaining the flexibility to change without warning. * * *

The letter of our laws, our regulations, and our memorandums has been to provide for other circumstances than those in which we now operate. * * * We are aware of the changes that are taking place in the world and at an almost immeasurable rate. Our language has not kept abreast of our needs, brought on by the other changing factors. * * *

In our thinking and our planning for the future we must fit our words to our changing concepts. If the concepts of "military" and "civilian" are changing, so must the concepts of what constitutes service change. The principle that all citizens must contribute service to insure their survival will be more valid in the future than in the recent past. * * * Basic research, specific research, design of means of defense, and the production of these means are only a few of the many requirements for service in making and keeping our Nation a power for peace. * * *

Whether we wish it or not, the Selective Service System finds itself administratively in a position where it can exercise leadership in the establishment of the ever-changing concepts of what constitutes essential service for survival, or it can wait until legislation is modified to embody these concepts as they become generally accepted.

The law seems clear to me. Congress has repeatedly indicated its confidence in the Selective Service System to administer broad delegations of authority to aid in the accomplishment of the general objectives of survival. The law enunciates the principle of universality of service, which is sound. It provides for the implementation of that principle by service in the Armed Forces, which was based on the experience available when enacted. Great latitude has been given in the application of this principle, and this latitude must furnish the cushion to absorb the shocks inherent in the changing of the concepts as to what constitutes service.

In what follows I can do little more than embellish General Hershey's perceptive and penetrating statement. It would obviously ease his task and clarify and simplify the operations of the Selective Service System, from headquarters through the State organizations to the 4,000 local boards, if the letter of the draft law were changed to bring it into harmony with current manpower requirements.

Briefly, we may note a few of the changes that have taken place since 1955. The military manpower pool has grown to the point where the number of physically and mentally qualified young men supplied to the pool each month is nearly twice the number of monthly induction calls. Already the age of induction has risen nearly to 23, and Department of Defense officials admit that it will rise to age 24 or over by June 30, 1963. This will be the case notwithstanding the fact that the armed services have raised their standards in qualifying men for service. Now at least one-third of those who reach military age are disqualified for physical or mental reasons, and nearly one-quarter are disqualified because of alleged educational or mental deficiencies.

This change in standards means that the group of those eligible for service has been reduced in size, but that all the scientists and engineers except those with physical disabilities remain in it. The extent to which military requirements tap our annual output of scientists and engineers can only be approximated, and the following figures are merely an estimate based upon the best available information. In academic year 1956-57 approximately 50,000 male graduates in engineering and science finished their schooling and were eligible for military service. At the same time there were 19,300 men on active duty as ROTC graduates, and of this number, roughly 13,000 had majored in science or had graduated with degrees in engineering. Another

5,000 men were serving in the scientific and professional personnel program of the Army, and at least 10,000 to 12,000 more were in uniform, most of them without scientific assignments of any kind. In addition, 2,000 men were processed through the critical skills program, giving a total of some 30,000 to 32,000 men accounted for in connection with military service. These figures suggest that at any one time, under present procedures, a substantial supply of scientists and engineers is in uniform.

To the extent that these men's skills are needed in the armed services, the Selective Service System should assume the responsibility of selecting and assigning appropriate numbers to meet military needs. On the other hand, the System should have comparable discretion in selecting them for assignment to equally pressing civilian requirements in the interest of the national welfare and security. It may be claimed that this can be done now through the device of deferment in class II-S for students and class II-A for industrially employed scientists and engineers. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that deferment of any kind extends the liability of the deferred until age 35, a discriminatory penalty—at least for the many highly trained men who apply their skills to research, teaching, and industrial activities in the national interest.

Even at the depth of the recent recession, in November 1957, there was not enough scientific and engineering manpower to meet industrial, educational, and governmental requirements in many fields. And now, with steady recovery from the recession, severe shortages exist in electrical and electronics engineering, mechanical engineering, civil engineering, metallurgy, mathematics, and physics.

So much publicity has been given to the cutbacks in our industrial economy, the impression still lingers that there is currently a surplus of engineers and scientists. This is not the case, as a few facts and figures will conclusively demonstrate. Last June our schools of engineering graduated 9,548 electrical and electronics engineers. Yet, on July 1, the clearance list of unfilled job vacancies, issued by the Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, reported 987 unfilled positions in electrical engineering. The number has since risen to 1,916.

The situation is little better in mechanical engineering, in which there were 9,041 graduates last June. On July 1, 1958, the Bureau of Employment Security listed 919 unfilled positions, and the number rose to 1,238 before the end of July. As of February 25, the figure was 1,562. Vacancy listings in the engineering fields are usually entered with the city, State, and Federal employment services only as a last resort; hence these figures are but a partial measure of existing shortages.

May I also relate the placement experience of the American Institute of Physics at its recent New York meeting, January 28-31. A total of 350 physicists registered this past January for new positions. Of this number, 163 were already employed, 52 were undergraduate students expecting to receive bachelor's degrees this spring, and 123 were graduate students who will presumably be available for employment in June. Only 12 of the 350 were without employment. For these 350 trained men there were 1,528 positions available. The offerings came from 93 industrial organizations, 29 governmental agencies,

and 110 academic institutions—a total of 235. The number of vacancies would absorb half the entire class that will graduate with majors in physics this coming June, yet this registration took place 5 months before the end of the academic year.

I believe you will agree that there is a shortage of physicists and of electrical and mechanical engineers. The statistical evidence in the other fields mentioned is just as conclusive. As a single example I might add that 646 civil engineering jobs were unfilled as of February 25, and our road and public works programs are suffering accordingly.

I shall not attempt to project the Nation's long-range needs for scientists and engineers—that has been done by others more competent than I. Nor shall I try to draw comparisons between the output of technologists in the United States and in the U.S.S.R. The principal point that the members of the Scientific Manpower Commission believe will be of interest and concern to the Senate Committee on the Armed Services is the one that General Hershey has so effectively made; again I quote:

Basic research, specific research, design of means of defense, and the production of these means are only a few of the many requirements for service in making and keeping our nation a power for peace.

It is our conviction that the Selective Service System should be empowered, by the letter of the law, to select qualified men for assignment to these essential activities, upon many of which the military forces themselves are absolutely dependent.

Again, we find ourselves in full agreement with General Hershey when we says:

The law enunciates the principle of universality of service, which is sound.

It is our conviction that scientists and engineers owe service to the Nation. It is not our intention that they be excused, or deferred, or exempted from this obligation, which all of us should be proud to assume. The fact is, we want them to serve the Nation more effectively through the application of their special training, of which comparatively little use is being made in any of the branches of the service.

House Resolution 2260 asks for the extension of the present Draft Act, which was passed in 1951. As General Hershey points out, times have changed, and "our language has not kept abreast of our needs." In 1951 we needed a larger Military Establishment, which had to be created from a critically small military manpower pool. At that time, as in 1955, we were only partially aware of the technological advances that had been made by the Russians. In 1959 we can—and must—recognize by law that we have other than military needs, and we must seek the means to meet them.

In supporting H.R. 2260 the Department of Defense is concerned only with the assurance of meeting its own manpower needs—and rightly so, for that is its business. The Scientific Manpower Commission is equally concerned that these needs be met. But the Congress has a broader responsibility—namely, to assure that all vital manpower needs be met, including the military. Hence it is time that steps also be taken to select the brainpower for the technological struggle in which we are deeply involved. It is our recommendation, therefore, that this committee recognize the exigencies of the present situa-

tion by a simple amendment to H.R. 2260, wherein the Selective Service System will be empowered to select men with critical occupations for assignment as civilians to essential activities, as defined in the "Lists of Critical Occupations and Essential Activities," issued by the Departments of Labor and Commerce. We further propose that such assignments be in lieu of service in uniform and that they be for a period of time equivalent to the reserve obligation of men who serve the Nation in uniform.

We would object to the arbitrary placement of men in specific positions, but would advocate that they be required to remain employed in fields of activity that are basic to national welfare and security or, in the event of failure to do so, be required to meet their obligation to the Nation in uniform. It is our conviction that such a minor change in the phraseology of the present law is preferable to the existing provision that permits the Selective Service System to select men for service or for deferment. True, the authority to defer must remain, especially if we want some of our young men to continue their graduate studies to the point where they can be of greatest service in applying their special knowledge. It may even be useful to grant temporary occupational deferment to some men in industry who should reasonably and logically serve ultimately in uniform. Where the welfare and security of the United States require exceptional skills, however, the Selective Service System should be authorized by law to select and assign qualified men to meet these critical requirements.

The scientific and engineering professions applaud the leadership that has been so consistently displayed by the Selective Service System under General Hershey, but we believe the System should wait no longer—to use General Hershey's own words, "until legislation is modified to embody these concepts," which have been forced upon us by shifts in the balance of technological power.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions for Dr. Meyerhoff?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, might I ask just one?

Chairman RUSSELL. Indeed, yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. On page 8, Mr. Meyerhoff, in the second paragraph, you suggest an amendment.

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, I was just looking hastily through the act and I think it would be very helpful if you would submit the language of that amendment, because a lot would depend, it would seem to me, on the recommendation as to the language in which it was submitted, or put into the law.

Dr. MEYERHOFF. We will be very glad to do that, Senator. (Inserted at conclusion of Dr. Chilton's statement.)

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Engle.

Senator ENGLE. I had in mind the same question, Doctor, that Senator Saltonstall referred to.

Were you here when Congressman Curtis testified?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Yes, I was.

Senator ENGLE. This is in line with the kind of thinking he had in his statement; is it not?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Yes, sir, except I thought his proposal was very complicated, particularly for introduction into law and this, I believe, would take care of certain sections of it in a much simpler way.

Senator ENGLE. What this does is let them draft skilled men, send them to civilian occupations and give them credit against military service.

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Or assign them into the military service. We feel that the military should have first call on anyone whose skills are needed, for example, engineers are badly needed by the Corps of Engineers; occasionally, physicists, meteorologists, and even geologists are needed for terrain analysis, so we would certainly not wish any branch of the military to suffer from the loss of these people, but to give the Selective Service System the power of selection and placement. I think it would accomplish a great deal.

Senator ENGLE. Thank you very much.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bush had a question, I believe.

Senator BUSH. At the bottom of page 6 and top of page 7, you speak about the shortage of physicists and electrical and mechanical engineers.

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Yes.

Senator BUSH. That is a pretty serious shortage now, as you put it here, is it not?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Yes. I have used, in measuring the engineers, the figures given in the clearance list of the Department of Labor, and they admit very freely they are the last resort for people to come to with their shortages, when they cannot fill them otherwise. Then it is that they go to the clearance list, a list of vacancies which cannot be filled locally or regionally, so there is a nationwide shortage, which is only part of the total.

Senator BUSH. Would you care to express an opinion as to what we ought to do as a Nation to try to correct this shortage in those fields?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Well Senator Bush, this is one of two groups who have been investigating scientific manpower, and the Commission has done its job for something like 8 years. We are a little appalled to find that last year for the first time since 1954 the engineering enrollments went down very seriously and the freshman enrollment particularly. We are hopeful that that will be improved by a better quality of students and the actual loss in freshmen enrollment will not be reflected in the total number of graduations. However, there has been an earnest campaign to interest more youngsters, and just why we suffered the loss I don't know, but believe it may be in part due to inadequate preparation in high schools where many youngsters do not get sufficient mathematics to remain in college or enter college.

Senator BUSH. Do you think that our schools, in the secondary category, should be more insistent upon the taking of some of these courses that are regarded as difficult, such as mathematics and physics, chemistry, and so forth?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Very definitely, especially where youngsters show aptitude.

Senator BUSH. Yes. And, should be more of a disciplinary requirement at that level of education so that when you come up to the college level you will present a better crop, perhaps one that had been stimulated by learning in those fields in the high school category, do you agree with that?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. I agree heartily and may I say that the most appalling manpower waste that confronts us, as commissions, and I

say confronts the Nation, lies in the fact that until last year, only 1 percent—there was a shift of 1 percent, and only 52 percent of our youngsters entering engineering schools were finishing, and 48 percent dropped out.

Senator BUSH. Dropped out?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. That included a substantial number of those who were either flunked out or beat the school to the draw and got out before they were turned out.

We know that they were not stupid, they all had the mentality to enter, but there was something lacking there——

Senator BUSH. That is a serious matter.

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Very serious matter. If we could stop that drain, that dropout, I think our manpower problems in the technological field would be pretty well solved.

Senator BUSH. Just one more question, a very simple question: How are we going to get this message over to the school systems in the United States so that they will take the necessary steps to back up these programs in the secondary schools? How do we do that? Should this be done by Presidential speeches or how can it be done?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. I am happy to say that a great many schools are seriously concerned with it in the various systems and are doing something about it. It is a very difficult thing to do something with, but if I may give, for example another statistic, the NEA has an annual study of the number of teachers needed, and they have a complete survey for 31 States and in that survey it was found that something like 2,080, or 2,085 mathematics teachers—pardon me, 2,020 were needed, and only 1,086 could be located, a little over 50 percent had been trained in mathematics, or the teaching of mathematics, and in 1 place 17 art teachers were told to teach mathematics, or else they wouldn't have a math teacher. So, you can see that the schools are hard put really to give instruction with the number of teachers available.

As to the teachers in training, I am glad to say the number is increasing. On the other hand, this problem faced one of my other organizations—the fact that in the White House Conference on Higher Education, even the White House Conference on Public Schools, there was no attention whatever given to the curriculum, and that is a point you raised, Senator.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Cannon has a question.

Senator CANNON. Doctor, do you believe the so-called Defense Education Act as passed by the last Congress is going to effect this picture materially?

Dr. MEYERHOFF. I think it will assist it; yes. I believe, however, the principal point in that act which will do the most good is that of strengthening the counseling; the guidance of students and, of course, strengthening the training of teachers. Those two provisions in the act I think will get us somewhere. Others are helpful, but those two are to my mind, the most important.

I do not think that we need more scholarships. I am probably talking out of turn here, but the fact is our college enrollments this year are up something like 7.5 percent. Engineer enrollment is down, and freshmen enrolling is down to 10.5 percent.

You get the trend, but at the present time we have our youngsters in college and more paying their own way than ever before in our history. I don't think scholarships will do it.

It does mean selection, guidance and, of course, good instruction.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to have your thought provoking statement, Doctor Meyerhoff. Of course, this challenge in a technological age is an interesting one and Congress and all of the people, I think, are aware of it.

Senator ENGLE. May I suggest one thing? When you prepare the language Senator Saltonstall asked for, you might clarify the status of those who are assigned civilian service with reference to veterans' benefits, because that is where we are going to have the trouble.

Dr. MEYERHOFF. Yes; and thank you for that suggestion.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to have had you here, Doctor Meyerhoff.

The next witness is Dr. Thomas T. Chilton, whose efforts are in this same field, and he is appearing on behalf of the Engineering Manpower Commission.

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS R. CHILTON, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE ENGINEERING MANPOWER COMMISSION OF ENGINEERS JOINT COUNCIL

Dr. CHILTON. Mr. Chairman, I am a past president of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers which represents 13 national engineering societies.

I am past chairman of the Engineering Manpower Commission which is to deal with the problems of supply and demand for engineers and their effective utilization.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2260 would extend the power of induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act from June 30, 1959, to June 30, 1963. In view of the world situation, the Engineers Joint Council does not question the need for extension.

While the probable requirements of the Armed Forces on Selective Service promise to be relatively small, averaging about 100,000 men for the next 4 fiscal years based upon current strength, there is need to maintain the system to insure that the Armed Forces will have an adequate supply of manpower and our military strength will be maintained.

Since its enactment in World War I, Selective Service has been undergoing a transition from its original function of procuring men for military service so that in World War II it was properly said that Selective Service had two corollary responsibilities: One, to select men for deferment because of their occupational necessity or for other reasons, and two, to select men who were not deferrable, for induction into the Armed Forces.

Since World War II, there has been an even greater recognition of the problem of deferment, especially for occupational reasons so that today there is rather general agreement that each selective service registrant should serve the Nation where he can serve it best, whether such service be in the military or in some essential civilian activity.

All with agree that we are engaged in a technological race with the Russians which we cannot afford to lose, and that the new problems of the changing world of science and engineering require an entirely new approach and action upon that appraisal.

Our security and that of the free world depends (a) upon an ever-expanding, well-balanced, stable economy, and (b) a well-balanced national defense. Necessary to both (a) and (b) is the maintenance of a preeminent position in technological matters in which major dependance must be placed upon science and engineering.

Because of the cold war in which we are engaged, we are placed in the difficult position of providing an adequate defense through the maintenance of an expanding, well-balanced, stable economy virtually peacetime in scope, which is so necessary to our continued existence as a nation.

We know that the Russians are building an elite, or aristocracy of brains; that they are educating young people without apparent discrimination between men and women in those fields of primary interest to the state, such as science and engineering.

We probably could not hope to match the Russians in the total number of scientists and engineers produced under that system, nor could our economy as presently constituted absorb such great numbers. Rather, we are concerned with the training, allocation and utilization of the number of well-qualified scientists and engineers required by our economy.

That there is need for drastic change in our methods of training, allocation, and utilization of such specialized personnel is evident on every side, and that our very survival rests upon the continued and proper evaluation of these methods is beyond argument. That it is difficult for bureaucrats in Government, the military, business, labor, education, and other fields to change, poses one of our great problems in this regard.

Our people, however, have been startled by the recent scientific and other challenging developments by the Russians. Now, as in the past, they are looking to the scientific and engineering professions for bold and decisive leadership in the solution of various technological problems, including that of manpower, and they are looking to the Federal Government for the adoption of those policies which are necessary to our survival.

To do what we have done in the past, while adequate for that time, will not suffice in the future and our new concepts of what we need to do must be clearly stated by the Congress in legislation and carried out by the executive branch in action.

To that end, the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be broadened so that it is clear to everyone that men of high professional skill, especially those having critical occupations such as scientists and engineers engaged in essential civilian activities, may often serve the Nation to better advantage in their civilian activities than they would if inducted into the Armed Forces.

Relatively short periods of time spent in military service are not entirely lost to inductees of high skill, as is often argued by some; on the other hand, it is extremely difficult for the Armed Forces to utilize the skills of highly trained professionals such as scientists and engineers during the relatively short period of 2 years following induction, and while the Armed Forces have made commendable efforts to utilize

professional skills such as scientists and engineers, those efforts have been fraught with considerable difficulty because of the time factor above set forth, and it may be added that it would be equally difficult for other employers to effectively utilize men of high professional skill for such a relatively short period.

There are times, of course, when the Armed Forces will have need for high professional skills such as scientists and engineers and there may be times when there is an overriding military necessity requiring the induction of registrants having such professional skills.

In such instances, the men required should be inducted and not left in their civilian employment. We are thinking, rather, of the substantial number of young men of high professional skill such as scientists and engineers, whose skills cannot be adequately utilized in the Armed Forces and for whose induction there is no overriding military necessity, and say that they should be left in their critical occupations in essential civilian activities in the national interest rather than inducted into the Armed Forces.

Frankly, we are more concerned about the future than we are about the present, for generally there is no great present problem of occupational deferment, for the Selective Service System is, as we have said, with but few exceptions, deferring young men of high professional skill because of their occupational necessity. Rather, our concern is for the future and for the situation that might require a buildup of the Armed Forces of the Korean type where it would be necessary for the Armed Forces to expand by at least 50 percent in a relatively short period of time, or for a more serious situation where the buildup would be several times the present strength.

In these situations there would be an immediate heavy drain on our young men 18½ to 26, for military service, and, if the pattern of World War II were followed, practically all physically qualified young men in that age group would be called for military service.

This we could ill afford in any future mobilization, large or small, for it is obvious that we must maintain our technological strength, and we can only insure that by training, allocating, and utilizing in essential civilian employment the requisite number of scientists, engineers, and other high skills.

It is getting late, but there is still time if we act now and purposefully. The solution of our present technological problem which involves the survival of the Nation, requires the boldest and most imaginative steps and action unprecedented in the history of the Republic.

To that end, it is the recommendation of the Engineers Joint Council that section I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which sets forth the intent of Congress, be broadened so as to make it clear that scientists and engineers and other high professional skills are not to be withdrawn from their critical occupations in essential civilian activities for military service unless there is need for such critical skills in the Armed Forces or there is an overriding military necessity.

But we have a much more far-reaching suggestion: We believe the time has come when the Nation must recognize in its basic manpower legislation, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, that selective service registrants having critical skills, such as scientists and engineers, may be selected to serve the Nation in essential civilian activities rather than in the Armed Forces.

To that end we suggest that the Universal Military Training and Service Act be further amended so as to authorize selective service local boards to select men having critical skills for assignment to essential civilian activities in lieu of induction into the Armed Forces.

This is not national service, for all we propose is something akin to the Tydings amendment of 1942 during World War II under which agricultural workers were deferred from induction so long as they were necessary men in agriculture. That, however, was a negative approach. What we propose here is a positive one; namely, that the Government shall recognize that the optimum utilization of men having high professional skills, that is, critical occupations and engaged in essential activities, is sufficiently important in the technological race with Russia so as to require the assignment of such men by selective service local boards to essential civilian activities.

The registrant so selected for assignment would be free to move and to engage in the employment of his choice so long as he was using his critical skill in an essential civilian activity. We would suggest that he be required to serve under assignment for a total period of 72 months—approximately the same period of Active and Reserve service now required of the inductee—following which he would be relieved of his military obligation; provided, of course, the military situation did not change.

If the military situation worsened, the registrant's file would then be reviewed by the local board and the individual selected for further assignment to essential civilian activity, or for induction into the Armed Forces, as the national interest might require.

These are actions that the Nation would have to take in the event of a partial or full mobilization, and it is far better to establish the principles now and perfect the operation while we have time, than to wait until we are in the throes of a new mobilization during which, for a time at least, there would be great confusion and uncertainty in the Federal Government and selective service, as well as the people, as to just where the best interests of the Nation might lie in manpower matters.

I want to thank the chairman and the committee for the opportunity of appearing this morning and presenting the views of the Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Dr. Chilton. Are there any questions?

Senator BUSH. Doctor, you make a suggestion here that your predecessor in manpower proposed about this special treatment of these men with special skills. You say that they should serve 72 months.

Now just how do you visualize that that would work? Instead of having them drafted for the service, you say they should be assigned to some civilian activity. Do you mean something like Douglas Aircraft, making missiles, or Convair or Aerojet? Is that what you have in mind?

Dr. CHILTON. My concept is that they would be assigned to that activity as long as that activity qualified under the changing and currently redefined lists and definitions issued by the Commerce and Labor Departments, and that they would still be qualified for such an assignment; still be eligible for such an assignment; that it would not be an assignment to a particular location, but to an activity as so defined.

Senator BUSH. Then would the selective service organization have supervision over them? Is there some sort of discipline there that ties them to the Government service?

Dr. CHILTON. Well, the responsibility rests on registrants now, as I understand the application of the act, to report to the selective service local board any change in his status whatever, and upon such a change, the determination could then be made as to whether he remained qualified for this assignment to which he might be put.

Senator BUSH. Your proposition presumes that there would always be employment available in some of these organizations, doesn't it?

Dr. CHILTON. Yes, and that the activity would remain essential and the skills would remain critical. To the extent that that is not fulfilled, the man would become available to selective service for induction.

Senator BUSH. Suppose he gets fired, then what happens to him?

Dr. CHILTON. That would be worked out. Presumably, the local boards could take recognition of the fact that he was making himself available for such service and would give him time to change employers, if that were necessary.

Senator BUSH. But, during his employment in this 6-year period, he would be, say, under the discipline of whatever civilian organization he was under?

Dr. CHILTON. Entirely.

Senator BUSH. He would be paid as a civilian and have the rights and benefits of other employees in such civilian organizations?

Dr. CHILTON. It wouldn't be changed in any respect any more than if he was simply deferred under the existing provisions of the selective service law. That is our concept.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Case?

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Chilton's suggestion is an interesting one and somewhat similar to what Dr. Meyerhoff suggested in the broadening powers of the Selective Service System, and I quote from his statement:

To enable it, by statutory provision, to select men with critically needs skills for assignment to civilian activities that are essential to the national welfare and security.

Have you thought about the possible constitutional problem there?

Dr. CHILTON. Well, I hope you understand, Senator, that we are not proposing to assign a man to a job, but merely that he would be classified by the local board as eligible for continuation of this assignment as long as he was employed in an activity that was considered essential and utilizing the skills that are defined as critical under these definitions.

Senator CASE. Well, the objective, I think, is attractive in some respects, certainly. But during the war when the gold mine closing order was put into effect, gold mines were closed on the theory that the closing of them would drive or impel the miner thrown out of work there to go to the copper mines. It didn't wholly work out that way, but in any event at the time, I think the fear was expressed that there was no constitutional grounds on which they could insure that the gold miner would go into the copper mines, and I am just a little

fearful that you might run into something of the same kind there, the constitutional question that was raised at that time by some people.

Dr. CHILTON. I have confidence that the flexibility that can be put into the selective service with this revisal would take care of such a situation without any conflict.

Senator CASE. I think that the constitutional power of the Government to draft a man for military service or for whatever service is regarded as essential to the national defense and is well established, provided the employment or the assignment is under the direct control of the Government; or if he is, in fact, essentially working for the Government.

Now whether there is authority to tell a man that he has to go into a certain employment, I just don't know.

Dr. CHILTON. Well, I certainly don't envisage that a specific point of employment would be ever be brought into this.

Senator CASE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BUSH. Might I ask a question? The Government wouldn't have the same authority over him that it would have if he were in a military status. In other words, you require a man to do military service, you see?

Senator CASE. But he is working for the Government there.

Senator BUSH. That is right. The theory would be, as I understand it, indirectly he would be fulfilling his obligation to the Government and doing his service to the Government in this other way, and, therefore, the same authority would apply.

Chairman RUSSELL. This is not a new question. It has been raised before as to whether the Government can assign a man to a civilian job or whether it can exempt him from the military so long as he fulfills some civilian employment.

It is one that we have had for several years.

Dr. CHILTON. This is the same basis you use for deferment and he wouldn't be working for the Government in any sense, but we believe he would be fulfilling his obligation of service to the country, if not to the organized Government.

Senator CASE. It would be a sort of a proposition of do this or else, and if you don't do this, you are drafted.

Dr. CHILTON. He would have wide freedom of choice of employers as long as the employment was available and essential.

Chairman RUSSELL. In his particular specialty.

Dr. CHILTON. Yes.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any further questions?

Dr. CHILTON. We will be glad to supply the language of our suggested amendment.

Senator RUSSELL. We will be very glad to get your suggested amendment.

(The following letter and amendment were subsequently submitted:)

SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1959.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Senate Committee on the Armed Services, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The Engineering and Scientific Manpower Commissions appreciate the invitation of the Senate Armed Services Committee to submit suggested language for amendments to the Universal Military Training and

Service Act in accordance with their recommendations presented before the committee on Tuesday, March 3, 1959.

We are attaching herewith the suggested amendments to H.R. 2260.

In the event that present laws do not cover the question raised by Senator Engle regarding veterans' benefits, we suggest that the committee consider the addition of the following amendment in an appropriate place: "No registrant so assigned shall be entitled to veterans' benefits by reason of such assignment."

May we again express our appreciation for the opportunity of presenting the recommendations of the Commissions, and if there is any way in which we can further cooperate with your committee, we shall deem it a privilege to do so.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. CHILTON

(For Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council).

HOWARD A. MEYERHOFF,

Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2260

On page 2 after line 10 insert the following new section :

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 1(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 605), as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'and national security'.

"(b) Section 1(e) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'in essential civilian activities and military activities, and that such critical manpower shall not be withdrawn from essential civilian activities for military service, unless there is need for such critical skills therein, or there is an overriding military necessity'.

"(c) Such Act is further amended by inserting after section 6 the following new section :

"ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONS HAVING CRITICAL SKILLS TO ESSENTIAL ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 7. Upon application of the registrant and in lieu of selection for induction into the Armed Forces, local boards may select registrants having critical skills for assignment to essential activities, anything in this title to the contrary notwithstanding. Each registrant so selected and assigned to essential activities shall be employed therein, including self-employment, for a period of 72 consecutive months unless sooner released by the local board and shall not be subject to induction while satisfactorily serving in such essential activities except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, in which event a registrant so assigned shall be eligible for continued assignment to essential activities unless the local board finds otherwise. If such registrant so assigned fails to satisfactorily serve in such essential activities he shall be subject, if not otherwise deferred, to induction into the Armed Forces, in accordance with the provisions of section 4. A registrant who has satisfactorily served in essential activities for 72 consecutive months, or who has been sooner released from such service by the local board, shall not be liable for induction and training under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, in which event he shall be eligible for further assignment to essential activities unless the local board finds otherwise'."

The next witness is the Reverend Duane H. Ramsey, who represents the General Brotherhood Board, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

STATEMENT OF REV. DUANE H. RAMSEY, WASHINGTON CITY CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN

Reverend RAMSEY. Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, my name is Duane H. Ramsey. I am the minister of the Washington City Church of the Brethren at Fourth Street and North Carolina Avenue SE., here in Washington, D.C.

The testimony I give is presented on behalf of the General Brotherhood Board of the Church of the Brethren, 22 South State Street,

Elgin, Ill., which functions as the administrative body of the denomination according to the principles, tenets, and decisions of the highest authority, the annual conference, of the Church of the Brethren.

Four years ago, an official representative of the Church of the Brethren presented testimony on behalf of our denomination in opposition to the Reserve Forces Act which at that time extended until June 30, 1959, the Government's power to draft men into the Armed Forces for a period of 2 years.

In that testimony, it was the position of the church that the bill should have been defeated, because:

1. It was another step in the direction of military dominance over our common life and a step away from the democratic principles and freedoms upon which this Nation was founded.

2. It indoctrinates youth subjected to it with authoritarian and militaristic ideals which are contrary to democratic philosophies and which generally have a disrupting influence on their lives.

3. It violates some very basic concepts of Jesus Christ and the teachings of the New Testament in that it depends upon the ways and powers of men for security more than the way and power of God.

Now, 4 years after the passing of this legislation, and during which conscription has continued in effect, there seems to be no valid reason for the church to alter its opposition; rather, we feel an increasing urgency to join the forces of other groups who believe that peacetime conscription, being unsound in principle, discriminatory in practice, and unnecessary in fact, should expire as scheduled on June 30, 1959.

A careful evaluation of the past 4 years indicates clearly that the present law gives the military influence and control over the lives of our young men which can be permanently damaging to the individual personality as well as to the soul of the Nation.

For many, it means disruption of college, marriage or vocational plans; it moulds them into institutional patterns and limits severely individual initiative; it encourages reliance on force and government.

When the law was enacted, it was intended to provide for universal training, but under actual operation it has been unfair and not at all universal.

As you know, by early 1957, 2.3 million, or 46 percent of the draft pool proved physically or mentally unfit for military service. An additional 1.4 million were deferred because they were fathers. Other deferments reduced the percentage of men actually drafted to less than 40 percent.

This would indicate, certainly, only a partial success in the universal training, the bill intended to accomplish. Thus, it could hardly be extended by reason of its universal nature for it has had none except to force into uncertainty the lives of all young men between the ages of 18 and 26.

The predicament these men face was clearly outlined by Congressman Romand C. Pucinski, speaking before the House of Representatives. He said, and I quote:

This uncertainty that these young people are constantly faced with makes it virtually impossible for them to plan their future in an orderly manner.

It was also indicated 4 years ago that conscription was a necessary part of our national security in terms of having vast numbers of men trained and ready for combat.

However, the studies of eminent men such as Pres. Ralph Cordiner of General Electric, have revealed that the training of draftees is inadequate and of minimum value for security purposes in our age.

Some of the conclusions of the Defense Advisory Committee headed by Mr. Cordiner were:

1. That it is almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years.
2. That since 97 out of every 100 draftees leaves as soon as their 2-year term ends, we are devoting 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay.
3. That the modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than the quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand, but it is much more a matter of the level of competence, skill, and experience of those people.

It would hardly seem, therefore, that conscription is either wise or effective as a means of adequate training or preparation for defense or security.

Testimony by proponents in favor of extending the draft have stated that it is necessary in order to force adequate numbers of men into volunteering—that enlistment quotas could not be met without the stimulus provided by the draft.

This seems to be very questionable justification for the conscription and subjection of the youth of our land to a compulsory military experience. It is unquestionably a very expensive method.

We note now that Congressman Byron L. Johnson of Colorado, speaking in opposition to the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives, listed 11 reasons for opposing the extension of the draft, the last of which we consider very important, and I quote:

It is time that the Nation challenge its youth not merely to learn how to launch an intercontinental ballistic missile that will mean the end of civilization, but instead challenge its youth to enlist for peace, to volunteer for peace building activity the world around.

The Nation ought to be planning to wage war on man's ancient enemies, which are disease, hunger, misery, and poverty. For this is the only war in which all mankind can be victorious.

Beyond this, the Church of the Brethren would finally oppose the extension of conscription for religious reasons.

We believe, and have declared officially that all war and preparation for war is sin. It seems to us an evil contrary to the life and message of Christ and the will of God. This position was officially reaffirmed in 1957 by 1,023 delegates representing over 200,000 members of our denomination.

It is our aim to be loyal and devoted citizens of our country with the understanding that loyalty to the State is always subject to a higher loyalty to God.

Unless our ways are God's ways, our ways are destined to failure. We feel our responsibility, therefore, to support legislation in harmony with God's law and to oppose that which is not.

In this attitude, it is our prayer that the members of this committee and of the Senate shall defeat the bill to extend the draft and immediately pursue the promotion and enactment of other methods which will establish and preserve peace and which are more in harmony with what we know is God's desire for man's life.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions of the Reverend?

It is good to have a system of government where every person can hold and express his opinions freely and the Government is glad to accord you that right, Reverend Ramsey.

Reverend RAMSEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Mr. E. Raymond Wilson who represents the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

STATEMENT OF E. RAYMOND WILSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to have my full testimony inserted in the record at this point and speak of it briefly.

Chairman RUSSELL. I will be glad to follow that course. You have been here before, Mr. Wilson, and have found that to be a very satisfactory arrangement.

(The full, prepared statement of Mr. E. Raymond Wilson is as follows:)

My name is E. Raymond Wilson. I am appearing on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, of which I am executive secretary.

I need not remind the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Society of Friends is a very democratically organized religious body. Each Friend cherishes the right to his own religious and political views and no organization or individual is empowered to speak for all Friends.

However, the Friends Committee on National Legislation has representatives from most of the Quaker yearly meetings and there never has been any official Friends body and few individual Friends who have supported military conscription. So in opposing extension of military conscription I believe that I represent the overwhelming sentiment of the members of the Society of Friends.

At its annual meeting in December 1958, the FCNL adopted the following statement of policy on this question:

"Conscription.—We reaffirm our determined opposition to continuation of selective service, to any form of compulsory Reserve system, to any form of universal military training and service, and to any form of compulsory participation in civil defense."

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO CONSCRIPTION

Our opposition to conscription is based primarily on the religious conviction that the whole war system, of which conscription is a part, is morally wrong and self-defeating. The perpetuation of military conscription is not the kind of leadership which the United States ought to be exerting both in the so-called free world and in the unfree world. It is fostering an illusion of national security based on massive military establishments, hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles, and threats of massive retaliation, and is holding back an all-out effort for effecting world organization and world disarmament.

This reliance upon military might and conscription blocks the kind of bold program needed to identify ourselves more fully with a hungry, sick, and impoverished world. It tends to separate us from the people who ought to be more wholeheartedly on our side in the struggle for freedom and progress against totalitarian ideas. And by no means the least consideration, military conscription runs counter to our own democratic ideals and history and exacts a heavy toll in this country in freedom of thought and choice and in its disruptive influence on the lives of young people.

BASIC OPPOSITION IS RELIGIOUS AND ETHICAL

The basic ground of our opposition to conscription is religious and ethical. Conscription of manpower has no purpose apart from war preparation or actual war. From the inception of the Society of Friends, Quakers have maintained that all war is utterly incompatible with the life and teachings and gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. I know of no Christian way to kill a man.

As Byron Haworth said in the House hearings, "No plea of necessity or policy, however urgent or peculiar can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe unto Him who has said, 'Love your enemies.' Under our interpretation of the Christian Gospel, we cannot recognize two doctrines, one for individuals as among themselves and another for nations."

AMERICAN MILITARISM LOSING US FRIENDS ABROAD

A little more than a year ago I came back from a year in which I traveled over 12,000 miles in the Orient trying to sense the thinking among some of the hundreds of millions of people in Asia. One dominant impression of that experience was how fast we are losing the confidence and good will of the people who ought to be our best friends, because of our overwhelming emphasis on military power and atomic weapons and the arrogance with which our country often throws its weight around in a military way. Day after day one reads in the Japanese press quotations from the belligerent speeches of our generals and admirals.

The American people ought to be more aware of the growing resentment to military bases and to the seeming extravagance of spending by military establishments and military personnel or their conduct in other ways. I was in Formosa when the American soldier shot the alleged prowler. When the GI was acquitted by the military court amid the cheers of the American soldiers in the courtroom, the unhappy train of events led to the sacking of the American Embassy and the United States Information Office.

When I asked officials in the Philippine Government what was bothering them about U.S.-Philippine relations they replied, "American tariffs and quotas on sugar, your quotas on Philippine embroideries when we buy most of our cotton from you, and your policy on military bases about which we do not feel that we can negotiate with you on a basis of equality." Apparently those feelings have increased since I was there and have led to a further slump in our relations with the Republic of the Philippines which ought to be the best in the Orient.

CONSCRIPTION HAS NOT KEPT NATIONS OUT OF WAR

Arnold Toynbee, in his monumental history has pointed out that militarism has been a major factor in the decay of civilizations. In the abridgment by Somerville "A Study of History," the historian asserts:

"Times of trouble produce militarism, which is a perversion of the human spirit into channels of mutual destruction. * * * Militarism * * * has been by far the commonest cause of breakdowns of civilizations during the last 4 or 5 millennia which have witnessed the score or so of breakdowns that are on record up to the present date. Militarism breaks a civilization down by causing local states to collide with one another in destructive fratricidal conflicts. In this suicidal process the entire social fabric becomes fuel to feed the devouring flame in the brazen bosom of Moloch. The single art of war makes progress at the expense of the divers arts of peace."

The building up of national armaments is both the effect of the insecurity felt by nations today, and a cause of a feeling of further insecurity. In Woodrow Wilson's second draft of the proposed Covenant of the League of Nations the signatories were to agree to abolish conscription and all other forms of compulsory military service. Later texts under consideration watered down and finally eliminated the idea of abolishing conscription. Jan Smuts in his "Plan for the League of Nations" in February 1919 recommended abolition of conscription and conscript armies, limitation of armaments, and nationalization of munitions production. While all these proposals bristle with difficulties, yet the general went on to say, "I would go so far as to say that while the great powers are allowed to raise conscript armies without hindrance or limit, it would be vain to expect the lasting preservation of world peace. * * * I look upon conscription as the taproot of militarism; unless that is cut, all our labors will eventually be in vain."

There have been varieties of military compulsion throughout much of recorded history. But conscription in the modern sense of levying a general obligation for military service upon every young man within certain age groups was initiated in France in 1798. Its first use was by Napoleon who boasted to Metternich in 1805 that he could use up 25,000 men a month. His defeat in

the Russian winter was dramatically pictured in the remarkable film of Tolstoy's "War and Peace."

France exported conscription to Prussia in 1808. Three times in the ensuing years, in 1871, in 1914, and in 1940, Germany attacked France with disastrous results.

In 1873 France helped Japan establish military conscription. During the Second World War Japan overran France's Far East colony, Indochina. Conscription in Japan materially aided the militarists whose policies culminated in attacks on Manchuria in 1931 and ultimately at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

MONUMENTAL EFFORT FOR PEACE NECESSARY

Peace will not be achieved by perpetuation of the cycle of suicidal arms races reinforced by a system of military conscription. It can be by a monumental effort for a strengthened United Nations, with universal membership and for universal disarmament under law down to internal and international policing levels.

BILLIONS FOR ARMS, TINY EXPENDITURES FOR DISARMAMENT

The last session of Congress voted more than \$47 billion for military defense, military aid, and defense support. This was about 66 percent of the year's appropriations. For nonmilitary aid, technical assistance, for developmental loan funds, for aid to refugees and victims of war and for all purposes of helping the rest of the world's 2 billion people in a nonmilitary way both directly and through the United Nations, the appropriation was only \$1.4 billion, or less than 2 percent. In searching for ways to find means of ending the arms race the Senate has just voted a paltry \$56,650 to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament. I wonder if there has been a year since the Second World War ended in 1945 in which the administration, the State Department, the Pentagon, and the Congress combined have spent a million dollars—or even half a million—on the specific and complicated problems that have to be solved in the field of world disarmament.

DANGERS TO THE UNITED STATES

We are in a desperate struggle with the Communist world for the minds and hearts of men. Increasingly this struggle is moving over into the economic and ideological field. Will the underdeveloped world attempt to advance by totalitarian methods or can we of the more fortunate nations help turn the tide with a broader program of economic aid, more sacrificial sharing of our food, resources, skills, and personal concern?

A United Nations survey some years ago estimated that it would take a gross capital investment of about \$19 billion a year from the more fortunate countries to increase the standard of living of the peoples of Asia and Africa by 2 percent per year. And yet the United States yearly spends considerably more than twice that amount on an arms program.

Yet our safety and our prosperity depend, in the long run, not only on abolishing war but on transferring our productive energy to the arts of peace and of reducing the widening gap between us and much of the rest of the world.

CONSCRIPTION ALIEN TO AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Many thousands of people came from Germany, Switzerland, France, Poland, and other European countries to escape the European system of conscription. From experience, they felt that military conscription led to war or was a great denial of fundamental freedoms. They came to this country to find freedom for their individual lives and freedom from war and from military domination.

Military conscription tends to restrict freedom of thought, as well as freedom of choice of occupation, and freedom of choice of use of time. While not every man is drafted, it is not his free choice, but the decision of the state through the Selective Service System, that decides where and how and when.

CONSCRIPTION ADVERSELY AFFECTS AMERICA'S CHIEF ASSET—ITS YOUTH

It is a disruptive influence on the upper grades of high school, on many men in college, and in the getting of a job when one of the first questions that may be asked is, "Have you completed your military service?" It complicates plans for marriage and a home and a permanent occupation. Congressman Roman

Pucinski, of Illinois, spoke in the House debate on the relationship between the draft and juvenile delinquency.

Sometimes before these hearings are concluded, we urge the Armed Services Committee to call before it educators, social workers, and advisers to young people to obtain their views on the effect of the draft on our educational system and its impact on the lives of our young people.

If the Department of Defense is granted a first mortgage on our young people without considering critically and at great length the adverse results of this action, Congress, in our view, is abdicating its responsibility to act in the public interest. It ought to take into account all the factors and sources of strength in our national life.

SUMMARY

Military conscription is contrary to our religious faith and to our understanding, as Friends, of the Christian Gospel. It is alien to the best traditions of American freedom at home and is an obstacle to the kind of worldwide leadership which the United States should be exerting now. It creates an illusion of national security and impedes an all-out effort for adequate world organization and world disarmament.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I am appearing in opposition to the extension of the draft for a variety of reasons.

The basic opposition of the society is religious and ethical because they believe that war, and preparation for war, is incompatible with the life and teachings of our Lord and Master, but I would like to discuss this question, Mr. Chairman, in a broader frame of reference than most of the discussion this morning. I think that we have confined our discussion too much to military and the immediate aspects of this problem.

I had the privilege of spending a year in the Far East, traveling some 12,000 miles trying to feel the pulse of the people of the Orient.

I came back from that experience very much concerned by the fact that it seemed to me that we were losing too fast many of the friends that we ought to have abroad because of our overwhelming emphasis on military; our policy on military bases; the extravagance of military spending; the conduct of American troops abroad, and yet, it is the uncommitted world that holds a great deal of the answer to our future peace and future prosperity.

It seems to me that this question ought to be looked at from the standpoint of our leadership in the free and unfree world, and it is not the kind of leadership that we ought to be exerting as a country of great democratic ideas and ideals for which we are the trustee and the exponent.

We ought to be increasingly the example and the leader to the rest of the world.

Let's look at the question a moment, historically. The world has had 150 years now with a system of military conscription. While there have been a variety of military compulsions in the past, going back even to Judah where they had at times conscription in the sense that we use it today, of levying a military obligation upon all men of a certain age so that the State can call up any or all of those that they want to.

It was first introduced in France on September 4, 1798. The first use of conscription in this sense was by Napoleon and he boasted that he could expend 25,000 men a month, a boast that he made in 1805.

You will recall that it was the Russian winter that defeated Napoleon and his conscript troops on the plains of Russia, and that has been very vividly pictured in the film, "Tolstoy—War and Peace."

The French didn't keep conscription themselves. It was exported across the Rhine to Prussia in 1880. In 1871 and 1914, and again in 1940, the Germans attacked the French with devastating results, so that the nation which instituted conscription found that it did not keep it out of war; it did not solve the problem of war, and did not assure victory in war.

In 1873, when the new Japan was only 5 years old, the French helped institute a system of conscription in the new Japan, partly on the grounds that the Japanese believed that requiring every young man, rich or poor, farmer or city boy, would help democratize the country and that this equality of service would help advance the many democratic ideas.

It was the Japanese who attacked the French in the Far East during the Second World War, and took away from them their Far Eastern colony, Indochina.

It was a system of military conscription in Japan which reenforced the power of the military and which was one factor in their attack on Manchuria in 1931 and which really launched the Far Eastern war and on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

So that what we are calling for, members of this committee, is not the perpetuation of a system of military conscription, but a monumental and all-out attack on the problem of war itself; a strengthened United Nations, a real attempt to identify ourselves with the 2 billion people on this globe who are our fellow men and most of whom are searching for more freedom, more liberty, and a better standard of living, and who are trying to build a kind of world in which mankind may live without fear of war.

Now that is not easy, and it can't be had without a big price in effort, of man and money. I would like to illustrate what I have in mind, Mr. Russell.

In 1952, I was in Vienna which was at that time under the occupation of the four occupying powers, and the country of Austria had four occupying armies and divisions.

I went to see the American Commissioner, one of our fine officers abroad, and I asked him what the chances were of an Austrian Peace Treaty. He said, "Mr. Wilson, we have tried 238 times to get a peace treaty. We haven't succeeded, but we are going to keep on trying and we are going to succeed."

That treaty wasn't a perfect treaty, but it did provide for the unification of Austria, and the withdrawal of forces and it is a treaty that has been honored since.

It is that kind of determined effort, to find a common ground without total war, that we fundamentally agree with, and in the achievement of stability and eventually, disarmament.

Take what the last Congress spent on military purposes—\$47 billion and over for military defense, military aid, and defense support.

Contrast that with the \$1.4 billion which was spent for all purposes of nonmilitary aid to the entire outside world, or 2 percent as against 66 percent.

In regard to establishing peace by military might, as against all the efforts political, economic, technical assistance, refugees, and so on, the Senate has just authorized the expenditure of the tiny sum of \$56,500 for its responsibility through the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament for this whole search to an answer to the arms race.

Contrast that with \$47 billion for maintaining the arms race. I am sorry Mr. Engle has left with one of just the kind of questions that need to be pursued in this field. It has been pointed out by the California Legislature repeatedly. They asked the Congress to start working on the question of the economics, first of changes in armaments spending and second, in the possibility of cutbacks in armament spending if we are able to achieve some kind of a workable disarmament agreement.

They pointed out in this resolution that if there was a 50 percent reduction in armaments expenditures in southern California alone, the southern half of the state, it would mean the necessity of transferring at least 200,000 workers to some other type of employment.

Finally, conscription is alien to the American tradition. I grew up in the State of Iowa. Many of my fellow citizens there came from Germany or Switzerland, Poland or France, Belgium or Holland, and many other countries where they had had this system of military conscription, hoping to find in the New World a land where they would be free from military compulsions and military domination.

I think our feeling, Mr. Chairman, is very close to the heart of millions of the American people, and it is the kind of society that we want to maintain and expand in this world.

I want to associate myself with many of the things which Congressman Curtis said this morning. His comments on the extremely brief and superficial consideration which the House gave this question, with practically no questions, no real examination of the kind of issues that were thrown out, and a brief debate on the House floor.

I was impressed by his statement of the disturbing and adverse effect on the colleges and high schools of a system of military conscription which only takes now a relatively small number of young men, but the system itself means that an uncertainty hangs over young men until they are 26 through 35.

In summary, military conscription is contrary to our Christian faith and to our understanding as Friends of the Christian Gospel.

It is alien to the best traditions of American freedom at home, and it is an obstacle to worldwide leadership which the United States should be exerting now.

It only creates an illusion of national security.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any question of Mr. Wilson?

Senator CASE. Mr. Wilson, you suggested the monumental effort for a strengthened United Nations.

What did you have in mind? How would you strengthen the United Nations?

Mr. WILSON. First, by trying to do more things through it, although we probably at this stage can't do everything through the U.N., but giving the benefit of the doubt to the machinery of the United Nations for negotiation and for the solving of political questions.

Second, in the United Nations to put much less emphasis upon victory by vote and much more emphasis on a really determined effort to find agreement, if agreement can honorably be found.

Third, a much more stepped up effort in the field of disarmament. We have insisted in the U.N. all along, on overwhelming numerical

superiority in our negotiations. That seems reasonable to us. The Soviets say that the veto is their alternative to it.

I think we need a more flexible and more willing spirit in the field of negotiation. I would like to see us substantially increase our economic aid through the U.N. and I am delighted at the President for asking for greatly enlarging the capital of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

I think the \$100 million start that was made last year was an encouraging thing, but it is only a tiny step to what different committees of the United Nations have advocated over the last few years—a \$3 billion or a \$5 billion program of worldwide economic aid which would be maybe 1 percent of our total national product, and a very tiny fraction of our military expenditures.

Those, sir, would be a few of the things.

Senator CASE. In short, you think that greater use of or reliance upon the U.N. would strengthen the U.N.?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, I think it would, and I think right now the suggestion that if there is to be a foreign ministers' conference or a summit conference, or both, that it might very well be that the Secretary General should be a party to those discussions or they should be more closely related to the U.N.

Senator CASE. Do you feel that the United Nations would be strengthened if the United States were to abandon conscription?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, I think our moral leadership would be considerably greater.

I think we have to do some other things along with that, because just abandoning conscription would be only one step, but I think it is a step we ought to take now.

It is what, 14 years now after the close of the Second World War, and we still have it.

Senator CASE. Are you familiar with the reasons or background for the abandonment of conscription by Great Britain recently?

Mr. WILSON. Not in detail, but the British, as I understand it, appointed a committee, a Royal Commission, to make a study of their military setup, and the question of conscription and the recommendation was that by 1960 they should abandon conscription.

Here is a country in a sense that is much more exposed than we are, and yet, they are going back to their traditional volunteer system and we have, in the past, very much prided ourselves in America upon the volunteer system throughout the services, as well as outside the services.

Senator CASE. Do you know what countries of the world today employ conscription?

Mr. WILSON. Well, it is the large percentage of them. I have seen those figures. They were a matter of rather common knowledge during the discussion on UMTS. There was one set prepared by the Selective Service System.

Senator CASE. Rather than just have a general observation on that, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask that the witness, if he cares to do so, supply us with the most authentic statement he can as to the employment of conscription by the several powers of the world today.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, I am sure if the witness doesn't wish to submit it, we can get it right quickly from the Selective Service System.

Senator CASE. I had anticipated asking that when General Hershey comes, but I was rather hoping by that question on England to develop the consideration that England gave in making an announcement, as I understood recently, that they were going to discontinue it.

Do you know why, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I think they feel that it is not the kind of a tradition that they want to continue, and they will put their emphasis upon a voluntary system.

There has been some discussion of that in the House of Representatives, and they have appointed a committee of the Armed Services to give some consideration to this matter of methods of recruiting manpower for the military services.

The fact that conscription is as widely used in the world as it is doesn't make it, from our point of view, a desirable system. It merely illustrates that the task of international abolition of conscription is one of the goals that we ought to be working for.

A few years ago, Congressman Martin, in the House, and Senator Hoey, in the Senate, introduced resolutions on the part of the United States to exert leadership on the abolition of conscription.

(Inserted for the record at this point is a tabulation giving conscription and military obligation in armies of the NATO countries which appeared in the House Armed Services Committee hearings.)

Conscription and military obligation in armies of NATO countries

Country	Period of active service (months)		Period of reserve obligation	Date of basic conscription authorization	Amended	Expires
	Actual	Legal				
Belgium.....	15	24	Age 35.....	1951		Indefinite.
Denmark.....	16	¹ 16	Age 50.....	1915 ²		Do.
France.....	³ 24	24	40 years ⁴	1928	1950, 1951, 1959.....	Do.
Germany.....	12	12	Age 35.....	1956		Do.
Greece.....	⁵ 18-21	24	Age 50.....	1930, 1932		Do.
Italy.....	18	18	Age 55 ⁶	1948		Do.
Luxembourg.....	12	12	Age 45.....	1945		Do.
Netherlands.....	18	12-24	Age 35.....	1887		Do.
Norway.....	16	16	Age 45.....	1929	1934, 1944, 1946.....	Do.
Portugal.....	18	24	Age 45.....	1937	1949.....	Do.
Turkey.....	24	24	No limit.....	1927	1949, 1950.....	Do.
United Kingdom ⁷	24	24	3½ years.....	1939	(⁸)	(⁹)

¹ 12 months for transportation troops.

² Conscription since 1840's.

³ May be extended by decree.

⁴ 17 years military reserves, 23 years "defense service" (civil defense).

⁵ 18 months of infantry, 21 months for other services.

⁶ Conscripts subject to recall until age 55.

⁷ England, Scotland, and Wales only; North Ireland not covered by National Services Act.

⁸ Successively extended since 1939.

⁹ Current policy contemplates termination of conscription in 1960. However, it is understood that the British Government has also stated some form of conscription would be necessary if voluntary recruitment failed.

Senator CASE. Do you think that the U.S. position within the United Nations would be effective if we were to end conscription?

Mr. WILSON. I think it would be one example of a moral and political leadership step that would be widely hailed.

I think there will be some countries that would look with some apprehension at the moment, since so much reliance has been put upon military strength in negotiation.

Senator CASE. Do you think that the position of the President of the United States at a summit conference, if it were to be held soon,

or the position of the Secretary of State, or the official representative in a conference of ministers, would be strengthened if the Congress at this time were to end Selective Service?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, particularly if they did several other things along with it.

Perhaps the height of the President's moral leadership was in December 1953 when he went to the U.N. and made a ringing appeal for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and that is the kind of example of the leadership that I wish our President and our Secretary of State, and our Congress would aspire to in leading the world forward, away from this overwhelming reliance upon military might.

Senator CASE. In all sincerity, Mr. Wilson, I doubt if there is any member of this committee or any member of the Congress that doesn't deeply desire to have the United States exercise all the moral leadership that it possibly can.

I personally have some reservations with respect to the way in which the Selective Service System is operated.

I think that this uncertainty that you referred to, that of the uneasiness of the young men and the discrimination and some of the other things that might be said about it, places a heavy burden upon the Defense Department and the Selective Service authorities to justify.

At the same time, I think that today we are confronting the Berlin question, among others, and I haven't been able to come to any conclusion that we would be improving the chances for world peace by going into a Summit Conference or a Foreign Ministers Conference at this time by suspending or ending the Selective Service Act on the evidence of such a meeting.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I wouldn't want to particularly stop there, in that kind of a meeting.

Mr. Finletter who was formerly Secretary of the Air Force, spoke before the National Council of Churches Conference in Cleveland last fall, and he called for American leadership in presenting to the world a comprehensive, overall plan for disarmament.

He said no country had come in with that kind of a plan since the end of the Second World War. I would think it would be going much further than just the renunciation of military conscription that we need at the present time, but if we just stand firm on Berlin and leave the question where it is, what does that mean?

It means that we are moving in the direction of the establishment of a conscription system in Germany which the world has fought against twice in our lifetime; we are moving in that direction in Japan, and I might say that I talked to the head of all the lawyers in Japan when I was there, and the whole burden of his talk to me was that if Japanese rearmament goes much further, the Japanese are going to lose too many of the liberties that they have had since the end of the war, in freedom from being pushed around by their military as they were in the 1920's and 1930's when I first went to Japan as a student.

It is going to take terrific effort to break through this cycle of fear and insecurity in the arms race, and the kind of blustering and threats and so on which the Soviet Union has been making.

Senator CASE. Well, again in all sincerity, I just doubt looking at the world situation as it is at the present time, that the Congress will fail to extend some form of Selective Service.

I don't believe that public opinion in the United States, with the United States facing both the situation in the Far East as well as in Europe, will support ending the Selective Service at this time. But I do think that we could greatly reduce the injustices and the discrimination in its operation and, by the same token, the weakness in our failure to do so would perpetuate it.

I was hopeful that this hearing would develop some concrete suggestions for improvement of the operation and the reduction of the discriminations and other inequities of the system as it is at the present time.

Mr. WILSON. Well, you had the move in the House to cut it back to 2 years with emphasis on making very fundamental studies.

Congressman Curtis made a good many suggestions this morning about the possibility of substituting people on a different basis than drafting for some of the functions now being done within the armed services.

Chairman RUSSELL. Anything further?

Senator CASE. No.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Wilson, we are pleased to have you present your views here.

The next witness is Rev. Paul Weaver, representing the Indiana Council of Churches.

**STATEMENT OF REV. E. PAUL WEAVER, REPRESENTING THE
INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, MEXICO, IND.**

Reverend WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the committee, I deeply appreciate the privilege of being able to appear before you today.

I am E. Paul Weaver, pastor of a rural church in Mexico, Ind. For a number of years prior to my service in Indiana, I served as a missionary in Nigeria. This past summer with my family, we revisited the mission in Nigeria.

We had ample opportunity to observe the changes that have taken place in that country in the past two decades. We were also in Paris on the night when General DeGaulle assumed power there. We were in Beirut while the UN police force was there, and a few days before the coming of the Marines. We were in Jerusalem, Jordan, at the time that King Feisal was killed in Iraq and when Hussein was threatened. We left the day before the British moved in.

We stopped on Cyprus at Nicosia at the time of great tension there. We traveled in Egypt at the time that Nasser was visiting with Tito. We visited Greece from Athens to the Albanian border. We had a week in Italy; 6 days in Switzerland; almost a month in Germany.

In Germany, we lived in German homes and had an intimate fellowship with people from all walks of life. We visited the refugee camps and the service projects in many parts of the world. We talked with the guards along the barbed wire boundary between the east and west zones.

We had many conversations with leaders of the German church as well as with their lay people. My daughter and son and my wife helped to do their full bit to build understanding between the countries that we visited and our own country.

We also visited in Belgium, Holland, England and Scotland.

I give this background material to assure you that I am not unaware of what is happening in the world. I recently completed two terms as first vice president of the Indiana Council of Churches. I am here today representing the Council.

On January 16, 1959, the delegates from the component Protestant denominations in Indiana, meeting in annual assembly at Indianapolis, voted their united support to a resolution stating:

Resolved, That we reaffirm our repeated opposition to any effort to fasten upon the American people any system of universal military training, and that we urge Congress to resist all efforts to use compulsion in the recruiting of our military forces.

Due to the speed with which these hearings were held, I feel certain that the distinguished members of this committee will appreciate the fact that there has been no time to get the council together to revise any way the explanatory statement which I make in support of the position taken by the Indiana Council of Churches and many other such organizations across our Nation.

Despite the many crises which occur constantly in our troubled world, we feel that there are some things which the Senate should bear in mind as you make the important decisions dealing with our Nation's military and foreign policies.

Many thoughtful people feel that conscription for masses of men is a dodo-like relic of earlier military methods.

There are many of our most concerned citizens who feel that continuation of the draft is a vast waste of both money and manpower. We feel that there is no deterrent power in saying to the Soviet Union that we are continuing the draft.

Russia and Red China have almost limitless masses of human beings. This surely is the wrong way to try to impress them if this is our aim. It could result in making them think that we are more foolish than we really are. They might attempt to advance further because of this folly.

The churches oppose the regimentation of our youth primarily from other reasons, however; we feel that if we regiment our youth and their lives, that this is a step away from freedom.

If we regiment the lives of our boys we could, with equal right, regiment the wealth of the adults.

Our taxes have approached this level without adding to them the burden of antiquated conscription. If we allow the regimentation of lives of boys and wealth, there is only a step to the conscription and eventual regimentation of labor.

Note then that what we may get in the name of defending freedom is the very denial of those things that we seek to preserve.

I pray of you that you might carefully consider whether we want to set up here in America a totalitarianism in the name of fighting it abroad. I can see how this might easily happen.

Hitler did not become absolute in 1 day. This is in no way any effort to impugn the motives of all those who support this regimentation. I am urging you not to smile too easily at the risks involved.

Psychologists and ministers and educators have noted the effect of the draft on many of our youth. Try as one may, it cannot be denied honestly that this draft is a very real factor in our juvenile delinquency, and in the listlessness of many of our youth who are in school and who should be studying.

I know that most folks feel that it is a foregone conclusion that the distinguished members of this committee intend to pass this legislation very quickly.

Many of us feel that in the event of another war, mankind would be the loser.

We would urge the U.S. Senate to join the nations which are trying to renounce conscription.

We urge you to put your time and our money and our lives in those things that make for peace.

I thank you.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Any questions? Senator Case?

Senator CASE. Yes, Mr. Chairman, on one point. In one place in your statement, you say:

Try as one may, one cannot deny that this draft is a very real factor in juvenile delinquency and in the listlessness of our youth in school who should be studying.

Do you have any facts or figures based upon any surveys to support the implied, affirmative statement there in your sentence?

Reverend WEAVER. Yes, I have seen the statements by the psychologists on this point. I have been an educator. I was a teacher in the public schools long before World War II, in Japan, and even now I get into a schoolroom quite frequently and help out when a teacher is needed.

I know I have a senior son of my own who is rather listless now because he faces this problem. I know his classmates intimately. They are not studying in school. They think it is groundless to study. They make a virtue of not doing their homework.

Senator CASE. Do they attribute it to the prospect of being drafted?

Reverend WEAVER. Most of the boys feel that the draft is going to get them anyway, what's the use?

Principals of schools all across the country that I associate with constantly tell me this—the boys feel it is no use to try to plan their own lives as the Government is going to tell them what to do, so why try?

Senator CASE. Have you seen any resolutions by a group of educators on that point?

Reverend WEAVER. Educators have been quite concerned about this.

Senator CASE. You are making these statements on the basis of your own observations. I am wondering if you have any precise figures or surveys or anything of the sort that would lend substance to this, in addition to your statement.

Reverend WEAVER. I think your National Education Association, there are officers there who could bring to you more evidence than I can.

I have talked with dozens of high school principals, and, of course, it is the high school principal who deals with this more than the grade school educators who face this problem; that they know their boys are just waiting for the draft to get them anyway, so they say what's the use?

Senator CASE. Has your son ever said that to you?

Reverend WEAVER. No, my son has not said this to me, but I cannot get him to study. I have tried as hard as I could, every method that I know and I can't get him to really apply himself and study. He

feels it doesn't make any difference what his grades are as the future is bleak.

The high school boys I work with almost every week have this feeling and they do express it and the principals have a great concern about this.

I have seen the statements of the psychologists, and perhaps you have, too, on this same subject. They are concerned on this point that it is a factor in juvenile delinquency. I hope my son will never be one of the delinquents.

Senator CASE. Have you seen any figures on that, or any statements by persons dealing with juvenile crime?

Reverend WEAVER. Dr. Crane, who has a column in some of the papers, has pointed out that this is one of the factors, and numerous psychologists have stated that also. It would be possible to bring this evidence to you.

Senator CASE. You know the superintendents of any correctional institutions who have made any study on this point?

Reverend WEAVER. As far as correctional institutions are concerned, I could not tell you that. There may be, I wouldn't be surprised if there were some studies made on this, but this is a matter of grave concern to us working with our young people, and I know the Senate is greatly concerned about the young people of America.

If we don't have good, young people to defend, what is the use of defending our country? So, you see we are defeating some of the very things we want to defend.

Senator CASE. Well, I think it is entirely possible that some young men may be a little listless about their studies and it may be that some of them are that way because of the prospects of the draft; but I was just wondering if there was anything concrete on that, or if it is simply just feeling or supposition on your part.

Reverend WEAVER. I believe that I can check and see what factual evidence we can supply your office with, Senator, and I will be glad to do that.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Senator Thurmond?

Senator THURMOND. No questions.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Senator Cannon?

Senator CANNON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Reverend Weaver, I, too, am quite concerned about the matter that Senator Case just mentioned. That is a rather strong indictment being charged against the draft, both in the educational field and the juvenile delinquency field, and if you can furnish any additional statistical data or supporting information for your statement as to juvenile delinquency, I would like to have it made a part of the record.

Reverend WEAVER. I will be glad to do that.

Senator CANNON. I don't like to see the subject of juvenile delinquency being taken away from where I think it rightly belongs, and being blamed on the draft or some abstract cause that may not exist.

I believe the juvenile delinquency field occurs before these people are involved with the draft.

If you have any statistical information supporting that, that you can furnish to the committee, I would very much like to see that made a part of the record.

Reverend WEAVER. I have stated that I will supply that.

My personal data that I readily have available would be conversations with high school principals, high school graduates, and high school teachers.

This is the testimony that they bring out without my eliciting it from them.

Teachers across our State have said this, and I contact educators across the country at various times, and that is also their feeling about it—their analysis.

It coincides with what I have heard from the psychologists dealing with this problem with many of our boys—that it is a disrupting factor in their life and I suppose that you may have teenagers in your home also, but they are usually disruptive anyway.

That is a very critical time in the life of our young people and, in addition to that, we throw in this additional factor that makes them wonder what the future is. Then they feel, what's the use?

You have cases of Russian roulette, and we find another thing that is going on—playing chicken with their cars on the highways, and they feel they are going to be drafted anyway and they feel they will take their chances on getting killed this way.

Many of the problems of juvenile delinquency do extend to this fact of the draft in their lives.

I wish you would set up a committee to study it yourself and see what the effect of the draft is on our own teenagers.

You can get much more evidence than I can. I have few contacts. You have contacts in every State.

If you set up a committee to do this, you will be amazed to find what you discover. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Information subsequently supplied is as follows:)

THE INDIANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Indianapolis, Ind.

ADDED STATEMENT OF REV. E. PAUL WEAVER TO SENATE ARMED SERVICES
COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am submitting herewith a statement made by the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski in the House of Representatives on February 5, 1959.

Mr. Pucinski as a newspaper writer in Chicago made a study of teenage gangs and of juvenile delinquency in that city. His statement summarizes his awareness of the connection between the draft and delinquency in that metropolis. I have asked his office to try to secure further documentation and submit it to the committee if possible before the report of these hearings is published.

Dr. George Crane, whose syndicated column on clinical psychology is published in many papers has repeatedly referred to cases that he has had in which the connection is a vital factor in juvenile delinquency.

In numerous personal contacts with high school teachers and principals when poor scholarship and delinquency is mentioned, these people who work so closely with our youth and really know our young people ascribe a close correlation between the draft and poor performance in school. Juvenile delinquency is also closely related.

If I can obtain further documentation before the hearings are printed, I shall do so. In the event that I cannot do this in time I shall submit the evidence to the members requesting the same. It is my hope that a careful study of this entire problem may be made by an unbiased Senate committee and that they may assign competent researchers to this particular aspect of the problem.

Sincerely,

E. PAUL WEAVER.

Enclosed: Statement by Representative Pucinski in House of Representatives, February 5, 1959.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am voting for this legislation with a heavy heart and with great misgivings. I just completed, before I came to the Congress, a very intensive survey in Chicago on teenage gangs and juvenile delinquency, and I find that the draft has a very important effect on the present development of our young people. Every youngster in my city between the ages of 18 and 26 has to register for the draft. This means that hundreds of thousands of youngsters are forced to live in a shadow of constant doubt as to their future when actually only a few thousand are ultimately drafted. This uncertainty that these young people are constantly faced with makes it virtually impossible for them to plan their future in an orderly manner. The most tragic aspect of this situation is that many young men who graduate from high school and who do not, or cannot because of economic reasons, go to college find it impossible to get decent employment because the first thing they are asked by a potential employer is what is his draft status. The moment a youngster admits that he is eligible for the draft he is either given the lowest type of employment or, as is the case in many instances, flatly denied employment. This tragic condition cannot be permitted to continue and we must provide some program for those youngsters who are under the shadow of the draft, but are never called, to be permitted to adjust their lives in an orderly manner. I could not begin to tell you the hardships that this situation is causing to thousands of youngsters who are not seeking a way to shirk responsibility but, who, because of the cumbersome mechanics of the draft, are involuntarily plunged into this pool of teenage idleness. So I am really hopeful that this committee will come up with some recommendations very quickly.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). If I might make one observation at this point, Reverend Weaver.

I think one of the finest things for sound psychology in the United States is to educate teachers and ministers to teach the youth of America that they owe an obligation to the Government. You might tell them the finest thing they can do is to answer the call of their country for military service when necessary.

Having served in the National Guard for many years and having had a lot of young men under my control, I think one of the best things to end juvenile delinquency is to take a juvenile and put him in the National Guard and make him subject to discipline. It is my observation that that will make him a better citizen.

Reverend WEAVER. Senator Ervin, on that point it seems to me that I have lived with the Germans for a while; I have lived as a guest of a German colonel who served 30 years in the German Army, and the same factor may be said of the Hitler conscription of his boys, that it made them finer people.

They did the same thing. They told them that they had to serve their country; it was the classic statement of Adolf Hitler.

We recognize it does not prepare them for democracy, but prepares them for regimentation. We want to be a free country here.

In all kindness to your position, I do feel that we ought to look at what it has done in other countries. Russia has a system, and it does not make them a free country, where they tell them that they have to die for Molotov, or Stalin, or Khrushchev, or whoever may be in power at the moment. You see, it did not make them a free country nor did it make Germany a free country.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). What has kept the United States a free country is that always men have been willing to serve in military organizations.

If you will pardon the personal illustration, my people came to this country in 1730 and with the exception of my father, every male in my line of descent, and my own son, have had to go to war. My son has had to go to two of them.

Reverend WEAVER. Was it the conscription that forced them into this?

Senator ERVIN (presiding). He was drafted at the age of 18 years to go into the Second World War, and I am proud of the fact that he has remained in the military service as a civilian soldier ever since. He is now with the National Guard of North Carolina.

Reverend WEAVER. I see. There is a very fine point between a volunteer—in which I think most of your ancestors engaged in—and the conscript army.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). But the law of my State said from the beginning that everybody between 18 and 45 was subject to militia service back in the old days.

I think most of us ought to read once in a while Kipling's poem entitled "God's of the Copy Book Heading" and it says this:

When the Camden Measures were forming, they promise perpetual peace.

They swore if He gave them our welcomes, that the wars of the tribes would cease, but when we disarmed, they sold us and delivered us bound to the pole.

Now, that has been the experience of the human race ever since. I am for peace, and I think we are going to have it, but I cannot see why a person does not owe the same obligation to his country to serve in the military forces as he does to pay, for instance, his income taxes.

I don't see why obligations are not equal to all people.

Now, I agree with people who have religious scruples against bearing arms, that they should not be required to actually bear arms, and I have a great respect for the Quakers. I have some Quaker ancestors myself, and I have a lot of constituents that are Quakers, but the Quakers have always been willing to do something in some other capacity when their country needed them.

We thank you, however, for coming here and expressing your opinion, and as I understand it you are not opposed to national defense, a strong national defense.

Reverend WEAVER. We feel there should be a careful study of this situation made.

We feel it is wrong for the Senate to rush into this in a very few days without a very careful study of other possible methods of meeting the needs of our day.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Thank you for expressing your opinion, Reverend Weaver.

Dr. Gingerich, of the Mennonite Central Committee is our next witness.

STATEMENT OF MELVIN GINGERICH, MANAGING EDITOR OF THE MENNONITE ENCYCLOPEDIA AND DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH OF THE MENNONITE RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Mr. GINGERICH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Melvin Gingerich and I live in Goshen, Ind., where I am managing editor of the Mennonite Encyclopedia and director of research of the Mennonite Research Foundation. I appear before you in behalf of the Mennonite Central Committee, organized in 1920, the service agency of approximately 160,000 Mennonites and related groups in the United States. Recently I served 2 years in the Orient

as a representative of this committee. Along with our Canadian affiliates, our organization in 1958 had 497 workers in 26 countries around the globe, because we are convinced that our Christian faith must find expression in deeds of love and mercy. As a church body we have believed since our beginning in 1525 that Christ commanded His disciples to return good for evil. Consequently our consciences have not allowed us to support programs of war or violence and thus we have been deeply concerned for the principle of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, suffering persecution and fleeing from one country to another rather than accepting a program that prohibited the free exercise of conscience. We are deeply grateful for the liberty that we have enjoyed in America. I speak here personally as one whose four great-grandfathers came to America to escape militarism and as the father of a son who was allowed to follow his conscience by serving 2 years in alternative service in the Middle East. We have confidence that the present Congress will continue to make provisions for conscientious objectors to war if military conscription should be renewed.

We nevertheless feel constrained to speak words of warning. History seems to teach us that they who place their trust in and eventually take up the sword will finally perish with the sword. In 1957 I heard the great historian Arnold Toynbee say in a public address in Tokyo that his conclusion after a lifetime of study is that the great civilizations of history fell because none of them learned how to deal with the problem of war. The warning of the Bible against placing our trust in horsemen and chariots, meaning military strength, is applicable to America. What appears to us to be the almost feverish preoccupation with American military superiority frightens many of our friends abroad and makes them wonder if our national motto is not "In a conscripted army, H-bombs, and guided missiles we trust." Reading our American periodicals abroad, I came to understand why statements by our military leaders such as those to the effect that we have demonstrated our capability of striking "any target on the face of the earth" are interpreted as boastful declarations of confidence in military power and even produce fear among our potential friends.

This trust in military power, the seeming growth of influence of the military in our political and national life, the apparent acceptance of peacetime conscription by a great number of people as the inevitable fate of America, and the military indoctrination of the young men in the armed services alarms us and causes us to fear that a spirit is developing in America which will eventually greatly restrict all of our freedoms, including religious liberty, as has nearly always happened when militarism became a powerful force in any nation's life. It is for this reason, as well as others, that we are appearing before you to register our hope that you may find a way out of the dilemma you face by either abolishing conscription or by taking other steps to limit it so that we and the world may be assured that America is not marching down the road toward militarism.

It is not our intention to minimize the problems America faces in preserving freedom. As a church committee we have heard the tragic stories of thousands of refugees who have fled from areas where freedom no longer existed and thus we know something of the nature of totalitarianism. We do not ask you to accept as a national policy the love ethic of the way of the cross when the majority of

Americans may not be prepared spiritually to love their enemies and to refrain from returning evil for evil. Nor do we presume to give you advice in the area of military strategy. We wish primarily to register our concern that the actions of Congress shall reflect a deep understanding of all aspects of the moral and spiritual strength of the Nation, for it is in these that genuine security resides.

In this connection we are reminded of the warning issued by Russell Davenport in his great book "The Dignity of Man," a book which Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. said could "change the whole course of human history," which stresses that the crisis of the West is a spiritual and a moral one. Davenport wrote:

Indeed, the entire thesis of those who place their primary faith in military power collapses as soon as one turns to the pronouncements of the great prophets of the Communist doctrine. From Marx to Stalin, those prophets have been unanimous in their affirmation that communism can, and will, capture men's minds. In the eyes of its leadership, at any rate, the real power and hope of the Communist movement lies in the very thing that Americans tend to discount—that is to say, in the ideology.

His book comes to the conclusion that in many areas of the world we are losing the battle for the minds of men precisely because we cannot carry on a vigorous campaign for freedom since we no longer understand its spiritual basis and have even accepted much of the secular materialism of that part of the world that has rejected freedom. This, we believe, is a correct analysis and causes us great concern. If America is to be strong, this problem must receive our greatest attention.

We have been impressed too with the words of Vice President Nixon who recently said when he introduced the documentary film "M.D. International," which explains the work of American doctors around the world:

In this day of great concern with weapons in our search for security and peace, this program documents a power some of us often overlook. It is the forceful good that lies in the basic brotherhood of man. In my travels around the world I've often observed how a hand outstretched in friendship, a heart full of good will, can do more to win the affectionate support of people than all the guns in our arsenal.

My experience as I observed our own young people and other voluntary ambassadors of good will at work in Japan, Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, India, Pakistan, and the Middle East confirmed these observations of our Vice President. The Mennonite Central Committee would agree with him that "through their humane work they are making a positive contribution to peace." One wonders what would happen if there would be sent to the corners of the earth by voluntary agencies many thousands of young Americans, encouraged by ample scholarships that would train them in meeting the needs of the underprivileged areas of our globe, in correct approaches to strange cultures, and in technical assistance skills.

We along with you are especially concerned for those people sometimes referred to as the "uncommitted nations" living in that area where most of the people of the earth reside and where is going on one of the greatest revolutions of all times—the great "Asian Revolution." The Communists have promised these people that which they want desperately—peace, and with it the opportunity to achieve the social and economic progress that will enable them to have doctors,

hospitals, schools, good roads, and other advantages they see other parts of the world enjoying. The result is that the Communists are looked upon by many as the party of peace in our day and we of the West are regarded as the followers of a religion that blesses and sanctifies violence. I remember one occasion when a group of Japanese high school teachers expressed amazement at the close of my address because they had never before heard a westerner oppose communism and advocate peace in the same speech.

Having given several hundred addresses followed by discussion periods before thousands of Orientals in four Far Eastern countries, I can testify that we have a tremendous job ahead of us in interpreting the better and we trust the true America—an America deeply interested in establishing understanding and good will among these uncommitted peoples who should be on the side of freedom in this great struggle for the minds of men. We who have uneasy consciences because of the disproportionate share of our tax money which is going into military expenditures in contrast to that which is going into nonmilitary foreign aid would be most happy to see the Senate explore new and dynamic ways in which our surplus foods and our technical skills could be used to wage peace in our world. To tip the balances in this direction the Mennonite Central Committee believes that discontinuing compulsory military service would demonstrate to doubting peoples that we have no aggressive purposes.

In summary, we are witnessing against military conscription because we believe it produces a false sense of security in military power, because conscription tends to promote militarism with all of its attendant evils, and because conscription helps to divert American thought and resources from a program of waging peace by nonmilitary means among all of our potential friends around the globe.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Senator Case, did you have some questions?

Senator CASE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gingerich, what is your specific recommendation, if any, with respect to phraseology in the bill or legislation that would preserve the opportunity for persons who do not believe in military service to render constructive or alternative service?

Mr. GINGERICH. I think the wording of the present bill is adequate as far as we are concerned.

Senator CASE. You are not suggesting any changes there?

Mr. GINGERICH. Not on that particular point.

Senator CASE. I notice that you spoke of your son who served two years in alternative service in the Middle East.

What did he do?

Mr. GINGERICH. He was a teacher in the American University at Beirut. He stayed a third year for additional service.

Senator CASE. And if the Selective Service Act were extended, you have no suggestions for modifying the language with respect to conscientious objectors?

Mr. GINGERICH. Personally, I have not. I have not entered into this aspect of it as fully as some of the other members of our committee have.

Now, they may be able to suggest changes but they have not said anything in the committee when I was present.

Senator CASE. If it should come to your attention, will you see that the committee has the benefit of any suggestions on that point?

Mr. GINGERICH. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. On page 4 of your statement, you referred to voluntary agencies going into various corners of the earth to meet the underprivileged. Do you intend to make a distinction between the giving of technical assistance by voluntary agencies and that which is provided under the nonmilitary phases of our foreign aid program?

Mr. GINGERICH. No, I merely placed that in because I do not believe that it would be very effective to draft a young man to go into an area such as this, to give 2 years of service if he, himself, would not be interested in that; if he was forced to go into the area contrary to his choice.

I do not believe he would be able to perform the greater service needed, so my hope would be that it would be possible to encourage our young people to go into this kind of service by means of some sort of subsidy.

Now, the subsidy might be governmental subsidy which would provide adequate scholarships so that they do not feel this debt of \$5,000 to \$10,000 hanging over their heads during their early years out of college, so that they could have some help during their period of preparation, and then go out voluntarily for these places of service around the world.

Senator CASE. Hasn't your church provided a fund to take care of the living expenses of members of your church who are assigned to some of this alternative service?

Mr. GINGERICH. Yes, we take care of their living expenses and pay them \$10 a month during the period they are serving, but that still doesn't take care of this problem of 4 or 5 years of college training and perhaps some subsidy would help that, would make it possible for them to not face this tremendous college debt that many of our young people have when they first come out of school.

Senator CASE. Do you know whether any attempt has been made to make personal services of such persons available to the International Cooperation Administration, that is the foreign aid program?

Mr. GINGERICH. Yes, we are cooperating with these various governmental agencies in their technical services. I might say that just a few days ago, a committee of our science professors from our college had a meeting.

There were a series of meetings that they had recently in which they are discussing very thoroughly what our colleges can do train more of our college people to give this type of technical service, prompted by spirit of love and good will in areas around the earth in voluntary agencies or even in governmental agencies.

We feel that there is a great possibility of building up a fund of good will around earth as Vice President Nixon said in his observation here, and the more we do have this, the more the faith in America's program will be accepted by these people who should be on the side of freedom.

Senator CASE. I noted that you said you had spoken in four Far Eastern countries and had given several hundred addresses. What countries were those?

Mr. GINGERICH. Japan, Korea, Formosa, and India.

I was in more countries than that, but those are the countries in which I had the opportunity to speak to young people, college students, and university groups.

Senator CASE. How recently?

Mr. GINGERICH. That was from September 1955 to December of 1957.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Senator Cannon, did you have some questions?

Senator CANNON. No, sir.

Senator ERVIN. Thank you, Mr. Gingrich. We appreciate you coming before the committee and giving us the benefit of your views.

Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt, of the National Civic League is our next witness.

STATEMENT OF DR. J. RAYMOND SCHMIDT, OF THE NATIONAL CIVIC LEAGUE

Mr. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt of Washington, D. C., and I appreciate the privilege of appearing here as a citizen and as general superintendent of the National Civic League.

My opposition to any form of compulsory peacetime military service developed quite naturally. My paternal grandfather, Phillip Schmidt, emigrated from Germany in 1848 to escape serving in the German Army as a conscript.

As the members of this committee well know many Germans, who are not lovers of war, came to America to enjoy our former freedom from military dictatorship. For the most part, they have been honest, law-abiding, and industrious. Whether Dunker, Mennonite, or Amish, they have made a valuable contribution to our national well-being, though not willing to engage in military service.

Other European nationals have also emigrated to America to live in a land free from militarism. I am thinking of the Scandinavians in our midst. It happens to be my pleasure and privilege to be affiliated in the International Order of Good Templars with many Swedish people who came to our country in the belief that their children might escape military conscription. Furthermore, a very large proportion of the people coming from Sweden, Norway, and Denmark have shown their appreciation of the opportunities offered by residence in America by losing no time in taking out naturalization papers.

When a powerful nation like the United States feels that it cannot give up the draft system it must be because of fear of an attack from an equally powerful nation. The nations charged with bringing on World War II are Germany and Japan, but they will be powerless to attempt another world conquest for many years to come, if ever.

On the other hand, the only nations capable of waging large scale warfare are our former allies, England and Russia. With these nations we are associated in a world peace organization, the United Nations, which was heralded at its founding 15 years ago as the best guarantee that World War III would be postponed for 50 years, or more.

The perfection of the deadly atomic and hydrogen bombs should easily make that a reasonable expectation. Why keep the Nation on

a permanent military basis when the young men trained within the next few years will, if still living, be well past middle life at the start of the next global war? Surely it cannot be that we have no faith whatever in the good intentions of England and Russia. It is difficult to conceive how our mighty allies can be less interested in maintaining peace than we are. Certainly they sustained even greater losses in World War II than we did, heavy as our losses were.

Then in the name of commonsense, why keep the Army on a war footing basis at heavy cost to the taxpayers, when there is no evidence that equally powerful nations are planning to attack our country? Or, could it be that America is developing a war party which hopes some day to conquer the world? History reveals that the idea of world conquest has always found fertile soil in nations well prepared to wage war.

As we see it, continuance of the draft system can mean only that our statesmen have very little faith that the United Nations Organization can prevent future wars. When we start training millions of young men, the movement to militarize the entire world will be underway. Because America persists in drafting young men for military service and maintains a mighty military machine to go with it, every nation upon the earth, small and great, will feel compelled to fall in line and be ready to go to war at a moment's notice. There can be but one tragic result; all the peoples of the earth reduced to slavery by the frightful cost of the armament race we have helped precipitate. It is unthinkable that our country will be the means of enthroning "Hitlerism" not only in America but around the world.

Reenactment of the draft law for another 4 years paves the way for placing our military system on a par with the detestable Prussian system at the height of its infamy. If the present trend continues, which God forbid, there will no longer be any American democracy. Militarism and democracy are incompatible; they cannot thrive together in the same country.

Democracy must be preserved. Hitlerism must be killed in the United States as well as in Germany. On these objectives we are agreed. Then let this worthy committee hasten their attainment by voting down the draft extension bill now under consideration.

A reprehensible feature of this bill is that boys 18½ years old are subject to being drafted into the Army. Likewise boys only 17 years of age may enlist in all branches of military service. We thoroughly agree with Representative Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, to the effect that even "6 months of active duty at that age subjects them to influences which they are not ready to cope with."

In substantiation of this point, we are pleased to quote Representative Edward H. Rees, of Kansas, as follows:

This bill should include legislation that would prohibit the use and sale of intoxicating liquors in or near military installations. I have received many complaints, not only from parents of those serving in the Armed Forces but from members of the Armed Forces themselves, with respect to the laxity of restrictions with respect to the use and sale of beer and other liquors in and around our training camps throughout the country.

My attention has been called to a campaign of business promotion among the liquor people urging them to advertise their brands extensively in military publications on the basis that "you can count on loyal customers for years to come if you sell them on the idea of

drinking while in the service. Get them while they are young and you'll never lose them."

The military authorities, to be consistent with State laws seeking moral protection of our youth, should voluntarily ban all alcoholic beverages from training camps and military establishments wherever located. This much is due the parents asked to surrender the moral training of their teenage boys to the several branches of the armed services. Furthermore, the future success of these young men as soldiers and later as civilians may depend upon their remaining abstainers from alcoholic beverages.

At this point let us take a look at the result of making alcoholic beverages accessible to our fighting men in World War II. According to Dr. Harvey J. Thompkins, chief of the Psycho-Neurotic Service of the Veterans' Administration, 10 percent of service men in veterans' hospitals prior to 1947 were there because of alcoholism. We do well to remember that these were not middle-aged alcoholics; for the most part they were young men perhaps under 25 or 30 years of age. These their country got that way despite the claim "that it would be impossible to drink enough beer to make a man drunk."

Moreover, if world war III is just around the corner, we as a nation had better do less drinking. That applies to civilians as well as military personnel, to mature men and women, as well as teenage boys and girls. Sobriety, not alcohol addiction, will be necessary to win a victory and preserve our independence as a nation.

Men in battle, including officers, admirals, and generals also, will need clear brains and steady nerves. Hence, the need of completely banishing all alcoholic beverages from all branches of military service. History reveals that alcohol has been a grave factor in the downfall of many nations. The same fate must not befall America. Hence, our plea to this committee to write the legislation necessary to safeguard our country from the sabotage and treachery inherent in beverage alcohol.

Senator ERVIN. Senator Case, do you have any questions?

Senator CASE. No.

Senator ERVIN. Senator Cannon?

Senator CANNON. No questions.

Senator ERVIN. Thank you, Dr. Schmidt, for your fine presentation.

Our next witness is Mr. James Harrington, representing the United States National Student Association. Mr. Harrington, we are happy to have you here with us. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF JAMES HARRINGTON, REPRESENTING THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the United States National Student Association is happy to have this opportunity to express its opinion concerning the extension and revision of the Selective Service System. The National Student Congress of the association has consistently viewed selective service policy as a matter widely affecting the national security and the life of each individual student. The association has consistently supported a selective service policy adequate to maintain the defense of the United States, but at the same time has supported provisions designed to maximize individual choice of program and to minimize inadequacies and hardships.

USNSA is a confederation of democratically elected student governing bodies in 380 colleges and universities with a total enrollment exceeding 1 million students in 45 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Hawaii. We represent a majority of the undergraduates registered at 4-year institutions. Association policy is determined by delegates of the member campuses meeting at the annual National Student Congress and, in the interim period, by regional representatives of the member schools meeting as the national executive committee of the association. Policy is administered by the officers elected as the National Student Congress by delegates.

The 400 delegates to the 10th National Student Congress at the University of Michigan in August 1957 declared:

Insofar as manpower for military purpose is drawn from his age group and service in the Armed Forces interrupts his education, the student is vitally concerned with military manpower policies * * * USNSA recognizes that the national security of the United States should be of great concern to every citizen, and that each citizen has an obligation to serve in the defense of his country in the most effective manner he can.

The national executive committee of the association, following a study made by the 11th National Student Congress and the educational affairs committee of the national executive committee, unanimously declared:

USNSA feels that cessation of the Korean emergency, the reduced manpower needs of the Armed Forces, and the growing number of people eligible for the draft combine to render the present Selective Service System grossly inequitable.

USNSA recognizes that the national security of the United States should be of great concern to every citizen, and that each citizen has an obligation to serve in the defense of his country in the most effective manner he can. A program of military training must be subject to regular review for possible revision or termination. Compulsory military training must be viewed as a temporary measure and undesirable as a permanent institution within our country.

A manpower policy consistent with our democratic tradition, the requirement of the national defense, and the variety of needs related to the development of our society must contain the following principles:

1. Universality of obligation for all male citizens to the defense needs of their country; recognizing, however, that this can include service in alternate critical areas as well as in the Armed Forces;
2. Certainty of service at a definite time, preferably immediately upon completion of formal education;
3. Inclusion of the draft in an overall military policy which includes a permanent volunteer military establishment and a trained Ready Reserve secured through the selective service;
4. Recognition that service in areas such as teaching, the foreign service, research and scientific development, technical assistance programs can be as vital to the national defense as service in the Armed Forces.

DECLARATION

USNSA favors amendment of the Selective Service Act to encompass these principles. In particular, it recommends:

1. Universal service upon completion of formal education;
2. A military program embodying 6 months active service, 3 years in the Active Reserve including 1 to 2 weeks annual summer camp during this period, and 2½ years in the Inactive Reserve;
3. Development of alternate service programs in a wide variety of critical areas, acceptance of each service embodying both an obligation to continue in it for a 2- to 3-year period and a permanent exemption (except in case of war) from conscription into the Armed Forces.

As we have stated, USNSA fully recognizes the important role of the Selective Service System and the need for continued compulsory induction. It is perfectly true that compulsory induction provides one of the major incentives for enlistment and for participation in many of the special programs offered for fulfillment of military obligation.

It is also true that induction, even if on a virtually standby basis, is necessary because of the possibility of a sudden need for increased Armed Forces. However, USNSA does not believe the need for continued power to induct through the Selective Service System should be construed as a need for continuation of the present act without careful consideration of possible inadequacies and inefficiency under it.

We would submit that the present Selective Service System and the present Universal Military Training and Service Act is not universal and is therefore neither equitable nor full effective. At present only one-quarter of the men turning 18 years of age in any one year can expect to serve in the Armed Forces. We realize that those not serving are either declared physically unfit, deferred because of occupation, or deferred because of fatherhood. However, we feel that physical and mental standards for deferment have been raised because of the surplus manpower and that the relative ease with which occupational deferment can be secured, and the total leniency in terms of fatherhood are related to the impossibility of using each individual in the Armed Forces, rather than to any more fundamental principle.

In addition to the inadequacies which we feel result from the use of only one-quarter of the youth now reaching the age of 18, we also feel that such a policy is inefficient. Defense needs are greater than specifically military needs. It seems to us that a Universal Service Act is both equitable and desirable; it seems to us further that the way to attain such an act is by broadening the present act to provide alternative services necessary to the national defense, but which do not necessarily involve service in the Armed Forces.

Actually, the establishment of alternative service programs, whether in diplomatic service, in overseas technical assistance programs, in teaching and research, in nursing and the medical profession, or in certain industrial positions, would not be as great a change in the act as it might seem. Many of these positions are already covered by vocational deferment. However, it seems to us that the certification of jobs in such fields as alternative means of fulfilling defense obligation should be superior to the present deferment system.

In the first place, it would provide certainty that once a man has entered a field which was classified as an alternative service post and completed a specified period of service at that post, he would know that he had permanently fulfilled his defense obligation, just as a person who has served in the Armed Forces and the Reserve knows that his obligation has been fulfilled, except in the case of outbreak of a major war. Second, the alternative service plan will provide greater incentive for those considering entering fields vital to the national defense, especially in a case of fields which are financially less rewarding or occupationally or locationally less desirable than others.

Finally and most important, such insistence on alternative service would tend to guarantee that each individual served in a way which would be most valuable to the national defense. It does not further

the national interest to have a highly educated young man competent to serve in the foreign service drafted for a period of 2 years before entering the foreign service, which he might have done 2 years earlier.

In addition, classification of nonmilitary defense jobs as alternative service would remove the implied stigma attached to persons who, for any reason other than obvious physical defects, do not serve in the Armed Forces. While it is true that a deferment is in no way legally reprehensible, there is a connotation of evasion of service in many people's minds when they think of a deferred executive, technician, or worker, on the one hand and a draftee on the other. This invidious very unfair comparison would, we feel, be greatly lessened were the concept of national defense service broadened to include such areas as those we have mentioned.

In terms of military service proper, recent testimony by experts, both within and without the Armed Forces, suggests that there are needs calling for two types of men. The first is the highly trained specialist, this need can be filled only by the career soldier. A 2-year draftee will not become a highly trained specialist. We feel that greater emphasis should be placed upon securing above average individuals as professional soldiers who will make a career of service in the Armed Forces.

The second need is for trained Reserve forces which could be used in an emergency such as that in Korea. This need in the past has largely been viewed as one which can be filled by the draftees, both while serving in the Armed Forces and while in the Reserves. In light of the length of time occupied by basic training and the lack of any appreciable military education in the remainder of the draftee's service, it seems logical to assume that this purpose could be served as well by a 6-month draft program and lengthened Reserve service as by the present 2-year draft program.

The association's congress delegates and national executive committee members are far from alone in feeling that the present Universal Military Training and Service Act does not affect students equally or equitably. A recent editorial in the *Concordian of Concordia College* in Moorehead, Minn., stated—

demoralizing has been the manifest breakdown of the Selective Service System in maintaining any semblance of universality; that is, a fairness as to which is drafted and who is not.

The result of this was cited by the University of Washington daily which said—

under these conditions, college counselors across the Nation are forced to advise or at least infer that students go to graduate school even though they are not ready, take a college major after consulting the draft exempt list, or become a father earlier than planned.

Other newspapers such as the *Kapaha Arrow* of Southeast Missouri State Teachers College have chosen to reprint portions of the article "Draft Dodger or Patriot" by Association Dean John C. Estie, of Amherst College. Whether original, influenced by Dean Estie's writing, or quoting from him, the editorials in general agree that selective service legislation is necessary but that the present system is not equitable.

A poll of USNSA member campuses designed to measure student government opinion of the resolution passed by the delegates at the

1958 national executive committee meeting is in progress. Because of limitations of time, somewhat meager returns are available as yet. However, the returns are impressive as over 80 percent of the campuses replying favor an alternative service system as outlined in the resolution. The remaining 20 percent favor continuation of the present Universal Military Training and Service Act with changes including liberalized occupational deferments and renewal of Federal education benefits to those who have served in the Armed Forces. No campus has as yet indicated support for abolition of the Selective Service Act, and indeed, almost no student counsel member from the campuses replying have favored ending the draft.

In summation, USNSA would like to note:

1. Its recognition of the necessity for an effective military manpower policy, but also for the need of considering defense manpower requirements as a whole and not purely as those of the Armed Forces;

2. The importance of providing true universality, certainly of service at a definite time, and minimum interference with an individual's career;

3. The desirability of recognizing that areas such as teaching, foreign service, research and scientific development, and technical assistance programs are as important in the national defense as service in the Armed Forces, and should therefore be classified as alternative means of fulfilling the universal defense obligation.

Therefore the United States National Student Association feels that the passage of H.R. 2260 as it now stands is not desirable. It urges that substantial modifications in the present Universal Military Training and Service Act be made along the lines indicated in this testimony.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). Mr. Harrington, in your statement you made several very constructive comments and pointed out what seems to me one of the unfortunate things in the administration of the law in the immediate past; and that is, that it is not any universal obligation imposed in administration. Some young men are called to serve and some are not, and I think you made a very constructive suggestion that there should be some definite, specific time where everyone should serve, and at a time not to interfere with his education. I think there is a good deal of wisdom in the suggestion that the alternative service that you mentioned.

I do want to commend your statement again.

Senator CASE, do you have questions?

Senator CASE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to second what you have said about the constructive character of Mr. Harrington's statement. I think it is very helpful to us. I was wondering if you could help us a little bit further by giving some suggestions how we would determine when formal education has been completed.

Your first recommendation in the declaration was universal service upon completion of formal education. Now, that varies with individuals. Some individuals never go beyond high school; some go beyond college and take graduate work. Would you seek to rate that out in terms of years in the law, or let the individual say when he feels that he has completed his formal education?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Our thinking has been more or less along the lines of the precise time, which is that you may obtain the 2-S deferment during your college career, and that you may apply for this to your draft board after you have graduated and you are a graduate, and if you want to go to law school or medical school or specific graduate programs, that this is something which is a privilege which can be granted by the draft board.

Senator CASE. With a requirement that the service would have to be initiated before a certain age?

Mr. HARRINGTON. We have not thought of that.

Senator CASE. You might get a deferment carried along until one was well into his thirties.

Mr. HARRINGTON. But this is of no moment actually, because in your consideration no matter what the age of a person is, he has his universal obligation and it is the person who has gone to college and graduate school and extended his college career to such a degree that he finishes his formal education at the age of 35, and still he would be prepared in an area that would be vital to the national defense, to serve in that area for that specified amount of time.

Senator CASE. I have a little fear that if the draft boards were to permit that long, you might have a changing world situation which might delay it.

Mr. HARRINGTON. We don't recommend that the draft board would ever possibly do that, but the idea is that no matter what the age, the universal obligation still exists.

Senator CASE. In your summarization you used the phrase "certainty of service at a definite time," and it seems to me that that description is desirable.

Personally, I have had the feeling in talking with young people that it was the indefiniteness of when they might be called and the fact that this might be, so to speak, hanging over their heads for a long period of time, that tended to make them indefinite in their planning, and they questioned their future and things of that sort.

I think if we could improve the universality and the definiteness of time of service, it would reduce some of the feeling of inequity or discrimination that now exists.

What about the age that is now provided for by the present law? Do you have any recommendations with regard to changing that?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Not specifically, because in a way this does not affect students as students. What we are concerned with is the fact that now with the manpower pool as it is, our problem used to be a problem of high school students, the uncertainty. Now it has really become a problem for those graduating from college or who are going to reach the age of 22 sometime during this previous year.

Now I do not want to appear to be refuting the speaker from Indiana, but it would appear that most students will use any excuse at all not to study and it is our opinion that this concerns college students also.

As far as the first 26 years or 30 years or 35 years, it would not work under the present system we recommend because those things now placed as a deferment would not in fact be a deferment, but will be part of the regular trend.

The completion of the formal education would not be regarded as a deferment at all.

Senator ERVIN (presiding). The committee thanks you again for your fine presentation.

The committee will now stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1:15 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 4, 1959.)

DRAFT EXTENSION

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1959

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 212 Senate Office Building.

Present: Senators Russell (presiding), Stennis, Bartlett, Saltonstall, Case, and Beall.

Also present: Messrs. Darden, Wingate, Braswell, and Atkinson of the committee staff.

Chairman RUSSELL. This morning we are continuing testimony by nongovernmental organizations and witnesses. We have scheduled a total of 18 witnesses, and if we are to hear all of them, it is important that we proceed as expeditiously as possible.

The first witness that we have listed for today is Representative Merwin Coad of Iowa. Congressman Coad will be a little late. The next witness listed is Representative Leonard G. Wolf of Iowa. Congressman Wolf.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONARD G. WOLF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a 2-year extension of the draft with a committee to study alternatives to the Selective Service System. If the authority to induct is approved for another 4 years, I fear that there will be a tendency for us to drag our feet in this study and 4 years will pass and we will still have no effective alternative formula to meet our military manpower needs. I believe that only a 2-year extension at this time will give impetus to such a study, and with this matter fresh in the minds of those persons who will conduct this study it will be possible to come up with possible workable solutions.

If we are not going to delude ourselves into thinking that we are adequately prepared, we must be willing to reexamine constantly the basic premises upon which our entire system of national defense is based. Obviously this is of paramount importance as a result of the tremendous changes in military technology which have occurred in the past 4 years and the now proved scientific and military strength of the Soviet Union as so startlingly dramatized by their sputnik, their growing fleet of nuclear warhead launching submarines, and the development of their ICBM.

Consequently, we should ask ourselves certain basic questions about our military system. Are conscripts and reservists being trained to

operate the complex instruments of military warfare, or are they rather serving as clerks, orderlies, and honor guards? If this is the case, we are suffering from a grandiose illusion if we think that such activity aids our national defense.

We should heed the advice of Adm. Arleigh Burke. He explains to us in candid terms the kind of military man which is needed in our defense forces. I think you will agree with me that we are fooling ourselves if we think we can get this kind of man from 2-year draftees or 6-month trainees.

Admiral Burke tells us that we need highly trained specialized forces, and I quote from his recent speech at Charleston, S.C.:

This means controlled, precision forces which can be operated with discrimination and finesse, forces armed with conventional weapons and small atomic weapons, forces which can apply the right degree of power with pinpoint accuracy.

We must now be willing to ask ourselves whether there is some other way of attracting men into the Army in the lower pay grades, thereby making it possible for us to eliminate the conscription system.

Furthermore, we must ask whether the \$14,000 that is spent on each conscript is not wasted when at the end of 2 years, just when he may become of some possible use to the national defense, the conscript leaves the service. We must ask whether or not that \$14,000 which is spent on each conscript or \$1,400 million spent on the approximately 100,000 inductees each year could better be spent in training and attracting those men who would be willing to make the armed services a career.

We are fooling ourselves into thinking that quantity of manpower means quality in terms of national security.

Since there is a tremendously high turnover in technical and scientific personnel a basic reexamination in this problem is demanded, with a view to upgrading the pay and other benefits of this type of military personnel in order to retain them in the service.

Finally, we might ask whether or not what is also demanded is a basic reevaluation into the "military" way of doing things and the role of the military in the eyes of the Nation.

As Gen. Harold Maddux, who directed the Defense Department's manpower requirements said in May 1958—

We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will.

I agree that right now we need the draft, because we have no prepared alternatives to offer in its place. However, it is clear that there are inequities in the working of the draft and questions about the effectiveness of conscripts which demand a reinvestigation and at most a 2-year extension. As responsible men we are forced to find these adequate alternatives if we hope to have a military system worthy to defend the free nations of the world.

I realize I have not covered all the arguments against a 4-year extension, and I would be glad to attempt to answer any questions you may have.

I would appreciate having placed in the hearings at this point my testimony on January 29 before the House Armed Services Committee, and my statement on the floor of the House on February 4 in behalf of my proposals.

Chairman RUSSELL. The matters referred to by Congressman Wolf will appear in the record at this point.

FLOOR STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN LEONARD G. WOLF (DEMOCRAT, IOWA) IN
SUPPORT OF A 2-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT, FEBRUARY 4, 1959

I want to make it clear as I begin that I do not question whether at this time we need the draft. Rather, I agree that right now we need the draft because we have no prepared alternatives to offer in its place. But I do not accept the theory that we will never have an alternative to the draft. It is my firm belief that if we work diligently at this problem, before the end of this 2-year period we will have arrived at a solution in which we can maintain the needed rate of enlistment without the necessity of peacetime military conscription. Furthermore, my position is based on the necessity of strengthening our national military posture, because I do not believe that we are getting the kind of men necessary to run the military equipment we are spending billions to get.

Hence, any arguments I make must be considered within this frame of reference: Do our military manpower policies give us greater security or not? The administration's position on the question of an automatic 4-year extension of the draft has been put well by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve, Finucane, who stated on page 35 of the committee hearings to the question presented by a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I quote: "Why not a longer period of time or a lesser period of time?" To this, Secretary Finucane said, and I quote: "I think your question is a good one, sir; historically the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past."

Mr. Chairman, the administration's position forces every Member of this Congress to ask himself another question: Is conforming to the habits of the past going to give us adequate national security in the space age? I submit to you, gentlemen, that this is exactly what an automatic 4-year extension does. Why should we have a 4-year extension? Do we fear to face up to fundamental weaknesses in our present military system? We must ask ourselves if in the space age when the Soviet bear is grinning and laughing at our faltering and futile gestures we are content "for conformity's sake" to carry on with the habits of the past. Are we so tired as a people, are we so timid as legislators, that we are willing to drift with the errors, inequities, and false security given to us by our Selective Service System? I do not think the American people want to drift. I am sure that they want not the questionable habits of the past—not conformity—but deliberation and decisive action. It is within this context that we must ask ourselves what we are going to do about the draft extension.

Before I go on, let me reiterate that at this time I am for a 2-year extension of the draft. If a 2-year extension is voted down, I will vote for a 4-year extension rather than none at all, but with a heavy heart. I am voting for an extension not because I believe that the draft is a panacea but because we do not have any effective alternatives ready to use in place of the draft. It is my feeling that this is because we have been shirking our obligation of reviewing in a comprehensive fashion the function and consequences of our military manpower policies. But because we may have shirked our obligations in the past does not mean that now we have to continue the old methods, continue burying our heads in the sand like so many ostriches. Hence the extension of the draft for a full 4 years is an easy way out. It is a way whereby Congress is able to shirk its solemn obligation for another 4 years to consider the problems of the draft. If, on the other hand, the draft is only renewed for 2 years, Congress is obligated to consider the problem of the selective service within the next 2 years. A joint committee or a committee of the Armed Services Committee is obligated to return to this Congress with a report that will either give us alternatives or change the existing system. Gentlemen, the 4-year draft, I fear, is a continuation of the policy of having quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security; it is a continuation of a drifting, shifting somnambulance which America can no longer afford.

Let me point out some of the serious and complex problems which our selective service and reserve policies have either caused or not resolved. At the present time the Federal Government spends as much as \$14,000 for the training of each draftee. Only 3 out of every 100 draftees reenlist after their 2-year term ends. The present high turnover of military personnel who are drafted consti-

tute a great waste of the taxpayer's money, adds to our mounting cost of national defense, and exerts an inflationary pressure on our national economy. More important, just as these men become trained and may be of some use to the armed services, they leave after their 2-year training period. Liddell Hart, the British strategist and military historian, has pointed out that the cost of training conscripts and other costs caused by the rapid turnover of short-term soldiers are not exceeded by gains in military power and military security. He states: "Conscripts cannot be trained in 18 months or 2 years to the high grade of skill required for modern warfare, for by the time they are trained to even an employment level so little of their period of service remains that their employment is bad economy."

We are all aware of the fact that present military strategy demands not masses of men who are ill trained, but manageable groups of men well trained in the tactics of modern warfare, the techniques of tactical nuclear warfare, the use of newly developed complex weapons and weapon systems. We do not have this when we have a large pool of men in the armed services who are biding their time until they leave the services. It should also be pointed out that it is not only the draftee who spends his time doing tasks that could be performed by civilians. Let me state in passing that this system is being used by the Air Force. They have been able to replace 43,000 airmen with 31,000 civilians in one noncombat area. The Regulars also become involved in this syndrome of wasteful activity. A large proportion of them become absorbed in the training machine for conscripts, and in "caretaker jobs at home and overseas." Do any of us here honestly believe that the 6-month active duty training program or the Air Force 10-week training program or even the 2-year military conscription program gives an enlisted man enough opportunity and training in the use of nuclear weapons so that he would be combat ready in any limited war?

We all recognize that during other great national emergencies democratic standards and ideals have had to be protected through the use of military conscription. This was accepted by our citizens during the Second World War because of the immediate necessity for mass armies and because conscription was universally applied. But now there is serious question as to the need for mass armies and further, under the present Selective Service System, more than one-half of the men in the eligible age group have by a combination of circumstances and means, including deferment, been excused from any form of military service. A large part of the burden of conscription has fallen unfairly upon youths who for economic reasons are unable to obtain draft deferment. These men cannot afford to attend college or must postpone marriage and the raising of a family.

According to John Graham, in a study prepared for the Fund for the Republic, there are as many as 60 ways for a young man to fulfill his military obligation without actually serving time in the draft. For example, in early 1957, the pool of draft-age men was about 5 million, of whom 2.3 million were fathers who consequently are indefinitely deferred under draft regulations. Conscientious objectors are deferred; many professional athletes will disqualify because of so-called physical handicaps; college students are deferred; scientists for the most part are deferred. By Executive order set forth in January 1956, men past 26 years of age are dropped to the bottom of the draft list. This has the effect of releasing these men from their military obligation. I am not arguing that these men should not be deferred. However, it is clear that the so-called universality of the system is nonexistent. Married students in college often have children to avoid going into the draft. Those who are unable to avoid the draft because of economic or social circumstances are the ones who must enter the Army at pay rates much lower than those prevailing in civilian life, thereby adding to their low economic status. Prof. John Galbraith, of Harvard, has asserted that "the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer who benefits by lower taxes to the impecunious young draftee." We are willing to have quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security. As Mr. Cordiner has pointed out in his now famous report, "the modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able at present and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time neces-

sary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force."

As Gen. Harold Maddux, who directs the Defense Department's manpower requirements, said in May 1958, "We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will."

We should not forget the harmful social costs which result from a draft which is universal in name but not in its functions. The draft is affecting adversely the lives of millions of young men and women who are facing the choice of further education, jobs, and marriage. John Graham has pointed out "uncertainties about the draft make it impossible for young men to plan ahead and as a result discourage them from getting the advanced training in the sciences or the professions which the country is needing increasingly." The feeling of loss, insecurity, and uselessness is compounded for thousands and thousands of young men who are already caught up with the bewildering and perplexing problems of adolescence and young adulthood.

In brief then, we are able to see military, economic, and political reasons for extending the draft for only 2 years until that time when we will have more effective alternatives than the draft system.

If I may, in my remaining few minutes I would like to answer certain important questions which may be asked of me. Some of you may ask, if we extend the draft for 2 years only there will be men who will not enlist in the service or the Reserve programs, whereas if we extend the draft for 4 years these men will take seriously our intentions of continuing the draft. To this I answer: The armed services may always draft more men during this 2-year period if enlistments are falling behind. Furthermore, at the end of the 2-year period we hope that effective alternatives to the present system will exist so that those who do not have the ability or the will to serve will not have to serve. If, on the other hand, it appears after careful study that there are no other alternatives, Congress may continue the draft for another 4 years, and I shall certainly support this.

It is clear that the Armed Services Committee and the Rules Committee acted with great speed to bring before this Congress a bill for a blanket extension. If the study suggests that a draft is the only answer to our military manpower problems, the Armed Services Committee and the Rules Committee will not be derelict in asking for an extension. Some of you may suggest that the administration needs a 4-year extension in order to be able to plan rationally its manpower program. To this I would like to answer in Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Finucane's terms: "Historically the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years, and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past." From this statement it is clear that planning does not demand 4 years. Only conformity demands 4 years.

Some of you may ask that the Cordiner report does many of the things that I suggest, but we still need the draft. I suggest that the Cordiner report deals only with reenlistment in attracting into the services on the lowest level. Increases were percentage-wise, which means that privates were only given \$3 a month increase, but generals were given as much as \$70 a month increases. Finally, some of you may ask: Isn't the draft needed to secure the services of the necessary unskilled manpower? Sufficient pay would attract such unskilled men as must be in uniform. It is foolish to waste skilled men by drafting them to do unskilled work. By rejecting those men in category IV, we are left with a body of men with a higher level of skill to do this unskilled work. It is a source of discontent to those skilled men who are drafted and assigned to tasks which do not utilize their capabilities. This is also a waste of the trained men who could be useful to the community in other activity or who might volunteer for more highly skilled work for a sustained period of time if offered better pay by the services. Impressed labor has not always turned out to be cheapest in the long run.

You may also ask: We tried in 1948 to get 2 million men on a voluntary basis and couldn't. How can we now hope to get 2½ million voluntarily? At that time, there were no programs of incentives to attract and retain manpower. Even so, reenlistments were 65 percent then (presumably because the choice of entering the service in the first place was purely voluntary, and not motivated at least in part by desire to avoid the draft, as now it is), and are only 8 percent now. (The drop is presumably due to the fact that many enlist to avoid the draft and are, therefore, anxious to serve as briefly as possible.) So the draft has actually been accompanied by a decrease in the reenlistment rate. This adds

to the amount of training which is wasted on men who leave the service before they have served long enough to justify the amounts spent to train them.

Let us accept the draft as necessary at this time, but I think it is of paramount importance to know what the draft is and what its weaknesses are. I believe that there is enough to show that the draft should be continued for only 2 years while some committee of Congress studies the military system and its manpower procurement policies. This is the only way we will discharge our obligation to ourselves and the American people. This is the only way that we may feel secure in the space age.

[From the Congressional Record, Jan. 29, 1959]

WOLF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

(Mr. Wolf asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the Armed Services Committee today to propose an extension of the draft for only 2 years rather than accept the administration's proposal for a 4-year extension.

Coincident to this bill I am introducing a concurrent resolution which calls for a 14-member joint committee which shall have a life of 18 months and shall conduct a full and complete investigation of, first, military conscription and Reserve policies; second, possible alternatives to the military conscription system.

This joint committee is of paramount important today for there are real questions as to the necessity of the draft and whether the present draft and Reserve programs are the right kind to give us maximum security in an age of complex military technology.

Perhaps we are fooling ourselves into thinking we are aiding our national defense through the military conscription program. Perhaps our military procurement policies gives us quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security.

I sincerely believe that by extending the draft for 2 years we are protecting ourselves, at the very least, according to the military theories presently accepted by the administration. However, by not extending the draft and Reserve programs for 4 years we are showing that we will not continue a conscription policy unless we have facts which show that this is the only kind of system that will enable us to achieve maximum national security. By having a joint committee investigation thoroughly study for 18 months military procurement policies and alternatives we are showing that we are not willing to cover up what might have been our mistakes in the past and what could become our fatal blunders in the future.

"TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD G. WOLF, OF IOWA, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTION OF THE DRAFT, JANUARY 29, 1959

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Leonard Wolf, Congressman from the Second District of Iowa. I thank the chairman and the committee for the opportunity to appear before you in support of my amendment to H.R. 2260. My amendment, if enacted into law, will extend until July 1, 1961, the authority to induct persons under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I am also introducing a concurrent resolution which will establish a joint congressional committee composed of seven Members of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives who will undertake a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces; and (2) the alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the personnel strength requisite for national security. Now I should like to explain why a number of my colleagues and I question a blanket 4-year extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"Seldom, if ever, has there been a time in our history when it was more important for us to be strong militarily and to have an impregnable defense posture. Not only is it important to the United States but it is important to the

entire free world. It will also demonstrate to the Communist world that we are constantly improving our military position. We are certain that no Member of Congress disagrees with the importance and necessity of our being militarily strong. There is, however, apparent disagreement as to how we should achieve and promote a defense system which will deter any would-be aggressor while maintaining our basic freedoms. Because of this disagreement it is of paramount importance that we review, reinvestigate, and reconsider certain of the basic assumptions inherent in our present military system.

"There is no phase of our Military Establishment which demands more general review and discussion than our military conscription system.

"Many responsible military leaders feel that the maximum strength of the Armed Forces cannot be maintained without the pressure of a Selective Service System. Consequently, no hasty action should be taken which would immediately end the draft. But, on the other hand, we cannot afford, either politically, morally, militarily, or socially, a mere blanket 4-year extension of the draft which will freeze into our military system until 1963 the present inefficiencies which are so much a part of the system which has come to be universal only in its discriminations, effective only in the perpetuation of the untested premise that there are no other effective alternatives to attract men to the armed services. I firmly believe that some of the arguments against conscription are so sound and raise such important questions that in the interest of both national security for the United States and freedom of our citizens we are forced to reconsider the administration request for a 4-year extension. Rather, I suggest a 2-year extension, during which a joint committee will, hopefully, seek rational alternatives to the present conscription method.

"1. One of the most telling points against our Selective Service System is an economic argument. At the present time, the Federal Government spends as much as \$14,000 for the training of each draftee. The present high turnover of military personnel who are drafted constitute a great waste of the taxpayers' money, adds to our mounting cost of national defense, and exerts an inflationary pressure on our whole economy. When these men leave the armed services, not only do millions of the taxpayers' dollars leave the services with them, but the services are then faced with the task of beginning all over again with training green recruits. B. H. Liddell Hart, the British strategist and military historian, in his book 'Defense of the West' argues that the cost of training conscripts and other costs caused by the rapid turnover of short-time soldiers are not exceeded by gains in military power and military security. He states 'conscripts cannot be trained in 18 months or 2 years to the high grade of skill required for modern warfare for by the time they are trained to even an "employment" level, so little of their period of service remains that their employment is bad economy.' Furthermore, conscription 'heavily handicaps the Regulars and their effective utilization for a very large proportion of them are absorbed directly or indirectly into the training machine for conscripts, and in "caretaker" jobs at home and overseas.' Many of the tasks which are performed by draftees and those who become Regulars through enlistment could very well be performed by civilians. For example, the Air Force put into practice a few years ago a project known as Project Native Son. The project called for the replacement of a military man by an indigenous civilian in those tasks which could be performed just as well by civilians. According to a report in 'Aviation Week,' September 6, 1954, the Air Force was able to relieve 43,000 military personnel for a new combat unit through the replacement of these men with only 31,000 civilian foreign nationals. Clearly, if such a program can be undertaken abroad and be successful, an even larger program using American citizens may profitably be undertaken in the United States. At the very least a study should be made of the possibility.

"The Cordiner Report, prepared at the request of the President, points out that only approximately 3 out of 100 draftees reenlist after their 2-year term ends. Mr. Cordiner underscores Liddell Hart's view when he states that the advance in 'modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years.' Mr. Cordiner also notes that these men, just at the moment they become useful, leave the service. This brings to mind two other important and enlightening statements presented in the Cordiner Report. Cordiner stated, after talking to hundreds of enlisted men, 'I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They (the men) were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who do not stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks.' Furthermore, the accident rate is very high because of the inexperience of men who use and man intricate weapons. The Armed Forces themselves

estimate that close to \$5 billion worth of equipment has been rendered useless because of these inexperienced men, according to the Cordiner Report. It is no wonder that now men who enter the 6-month program are not given any inkling of the use of modern weapons for fear they will damage the equipment. This, of course, raises the question of the merit of a program or system which now prepares men for the kind of war that was fought in 1939.

"The most obvious point made against military conscription is that it is based on compulsion and, therefore, is alien to American traditions because our society is based on voluntary actions of free individuals. Yet we all recognize that during other great national emergencies democratic standards and ideals have had to be protected through the use of military conscription. This was accepted by our citizens during the Second World War because of the immediate necessity for mass armies and because conscription was universally applied. But under the present Selective Service System, more than one-half of the men in the eligible age group have, by a combination of circumstances and means, including deferment, been excused from any form of military service. A large part of the burden of conscription has fallen unfairly upon youths who for economic reasons are unable to obtain draft deferments. These men are those who cannot afford to attend college or who must postpone marriage and the raising of a family. It is indeed an unfortunate thing when society aids its young men through devious means to avoid their draft obligation. According to John Graham, in a study prepared for the Fund for the Republic, there are as many as 60 ways for a young man to fulfill his military obligation without actually serving his time in the draft. For example, in early 1957 the pool of draft-age men was about 5 million, of whom 2.3 million were fathers who, consequently, are indefinitely deferred under draft regulations. Conscientious objectors are deferred; many professional athletes are disqualified because of physical handicaps; college students are deferred; scientists for the most part are deferred. By Executive order set forth in January 1956, men past 26 years of age are dropped to the bottom of the draft list. This has the effect of releasing these men from their military obligation. I am not arguing that these people should not be deferred. However, it is clear that the so-called universality of the system is nonexistent. Married students in college often have children to avoid going into the draft. Those who are unable to avoid the draft because of economic or social circumstances are the ones who must enter the Army at pay rates much lower than those prevailing in civilian life, thereby adding to their own economic burdens and delaying their own efforts to overcome their relatively low economic status. Prof. John Galbraith, of Harvard, has asserted that 'the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer who benefits by lower taxes to the impecunious young draftee.' We are willing to have quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security. As Mr. Cordiner has pointed out in his now famous report, 'the modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able to present and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force.'

"There is an apparent lack of enthusiasm for the present Reserve forces program. This is clearly understandable. New weapons have altered radically our national military strategy, and in so doing they have reduced our need for masses of military manpower. Be it right or wrong—and this question may well be one which would have to be reevaluated along with a basic review of our military manpower policies—our national military strategy now assumes that a major war fought with weapons of mass destruction would be brought to a decision in a relatively short period of time. These weapons of mass destruction, delivered by long-range bombers and ballistics missiles, supposedly would render mass armies obsolete. And if mass armies will be obsolete in a future war, so will those Reserve arms from which our mass armies are built. One justification for large Reserve forces, a justification which figures in prominence in the establishment of the 6-month program, is that in case of another Korea the necessary forces could be mobilized quickly from the military Reserve. However, the development and adoption of small-yield nuclear weapons for tactical use have supposedly led the Department of Defense and the administration to conclude that even in limited war modern technology reduces the need

for masses of men. Even if this is not true, can it be honestly said by anyone in the military that the 6-month program as it is presently constituted gives the enlisted man enough opportunity and training in the use of nuclear weapons so that he would be combat-ready in such a war? Do any of us have any illusions about a 6-month Reserve program or the Air Force 10-week training? Does anyone believe that these men are learning what must be learned about complex weapons and weapons systems which are necessary in either a tactical war or a total war? It would be impossible to teach these men in such a short time and have them of use to our national security. Here is an example of what I mean: Writing in the Nation, May 10, 1958, Eric Pearl, a veteran of the 6-month program, states: 'I was to learn nothing more than how to turn a radio on and how to shut one off, turn it on, shut it off, on, off. It required simulation, dedication, and no skill. I couldn't help sharing the guilt of my superiors for having let me get away with all this; and as I used to sit and look about my classroom at the many B.A.'s, and M.A.'s and LL.B.'s who were turning on and shutting off their radios, or as I looked through the window at the even greater number who were policing the area outside I could not stop myself from thinking of what a waste of talent it all was.'

"After all, not much can be accomplished in 10 weeks, 6 months, or 2 years where one considers the bewildering complexities of modern military technology, especially when the men in the program, both teachers and trainees, have no interest or intention of staying in the service. As the great historian Walter Millis has stated, and as was underscored at these hearings a few days ago by General Curtis LeMay, 'If we ever mobilized 37 infantry and armored divisions envisaged by the 1955 Reserve Act it seems most unlikely that we could transport or supply them over railways, through ports, and across beaches smoldering and radioactive from the nuclear fires. The ground soldier is thought of today primarily as an instrument for limited or brush fire wars; as such, he is scarcely any longer a ground soldier but must be air transportable, which limits his numbers severely. Military men now pretty generally believe that any major war will have to be fought to the end with whatever was ready at the beginnings—and that means combat-ready. If we should again be required to mobilize great masses of manpower, comparable to the 15 million men raised in 1941-45, most of them would have to be trained to complex technical skills not usually acquirable from the kind of training one gets in boot camp or in National Guard and Reserve units.'

"An argument which must be examined and met through extended study is the notion that the draft laws encourage enlistments in branches or services other than the Army. Although there are no clear answers to this as yet, I have certain comments about this. One might conjecture and feel reasonably safe in stating that those men who enlist in other services in order to avoid the draft will not reenlist after their 3-year period. We may find a clue for stating this in the fact that many college students enter ROTC in order to escape being enlisted men. However, at least 73 percent of those in ROTC programs quit the minute their compulsory tour of duty is up. This, in itself, is a shocking thing. Hundreds of boys who enter officer training programs are there for no other reason than they do not want to lead an enlisted man's life. Is this the way to develop dedicated, thoughtful, and responsible military leaders? Just as some men enter ROTC programs to escape being enlisted men, so it is that other men enter 3-year enlisted programs and leave them after 3 years to escape Army service for 2 years. This is supported, for example, by the fact that only 8 percent of first-term enlistees reenlisted in 1955. If this is true, the Army may well ask itself whether its contention is more sophistic than sound, for again, it is questionable whether 3-year enlistees are so much better than 2-year draftees, when you recognize that 3-year men aren't staying either. If it is not the case, then one of our basic reasons for continuing the draft is unsound.

"Finally, there is the question of individual liberty which must be considered. In a democracy and especially in the United States, we try to protect as many voluntary actions on the part of the individual as is conceivably possible while guaranteeing a well-ordered and secure society. In the past, war has made it necessary to suspend, in part, the voluntary aspect of our society. We are still doing this in our draft system; not as a result of the pressures of war but because of what might be a fundamental fear in actually facing up to the weakness of our present military system. This kind of fear, I need not tell you, could lead to the ultimate decline of the entire free world. Furthermore, it should be made clear that each time we suspend a voluntary action of an indi-

vidual or a group of individuals, without examining closely whether or not, we have to suspend the voluntary action, we are destroying that which has made the American form of government unique among nations. To arguments of this kind can be added many others. For example, it can hardly be expected that men living in a free and voluntary society who are forced involuntarily into military life for a fixed period of time will, by and large, be deeply motivated to give their best efforts while they wear a uniform, especially when there is no apparent reason for their being in uniform, when the tasks they perform have no relation to modern warfare. As Maj. Gen. Harold R. Maddux, who directs the Defense Department's division of manpower requirements, said in May 1958, " * * * We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will?

"John Graham has pointed out, "uncertainties about the draft make it impossible for young men to plan ahead and, as a result, discourage them from getting the advanced training in the sciences or professions that the country is needing increasingly." The feeling of loss, of insecurity, and uselessness is compounded for thousands and thousands of young men who are already caught up with the bewildering and perplexing problems of adolescence and young adulthood. In brief, there are many political, economic, and strategic reasons for believing that our Nation's military manpower problems would be solved best by the abolition of conscription and by reliance on a highly trained, highly skilled, and well-paid Army. The Cordiner report has recommended some ways in which such an army might be brought into existence. This report, however, did not adequately consider the problem of attracting men into service through higher incentives. It did suggest that a complete analysis and investigation be undertaken for the increase in quantity and quality of housing for military men and their families. The committee also urged more study of fringe benefits which would play an important role in maintaining and attracting a high caliber of men who would stay in the service for a longer period than either 2 or 3 years. It should be noted that when Congress increased the fringe benefits for members already in the armed services in 1955-56 the reenlistment rate climbed 10 percent or almost twice the reenlistment level of the previous year. This certainly suggests that even more use of fringe benefits and incentives will attract and keep the kind of men necessary to protect the free world.

"Clearly, the Cordiner report represents only a beginning of the studies which must be made before it is feasible to abolish conscription—as inefficient and inequitable as it may be. However, the Cordiner report shows that it is high time that we agree to reexamine all of the premises upon which our conscription method is based. Our greatest need with respect to national military manpower policy is a full-scale review of the problems, alternatives, and solutions which relate to this vital national security issue. This must be made lest we drift with the compounding errors and inequities of our conscription policies.

"Consequently, I am suggesting in a concurrent resolution that it is the responsibility and policy of the Congress to use all means possible to better provide for the common defense through the modernization of our military system in a manner calculated to promote maximum freedom for the individual and greater national security for the society. It can best do this through the establishment of a joint congressional committee which will review our conscription methods and possible alternatives to it during the next 18 months. This committee, I hope, will be comprised of members of the great Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, members of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House and Senate, and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

"In conjunction with my proposed committee, I am asking that the present Selective Service and Reserve Forces Act be extended for only 2 years, during which time this committee will be able to delve deeply and comprehensively into the manifold problems of our present military system. Then after a thorough study of the recommendations of this committee we can decide on whether or not the draft is to be extended or whether there are better alternatives to it.

"I thank this committee for the time given to me; and I thank especially the distinguished chairman, Mr. Vinson, for his help and understanding."

Chairman RUSSELL. Congressman, of course, this is a matter with which we are all very much concerned and that is the high degree

of technological skill that is necessary in today's warfare. We are moving in the direction of trying to have a highly skilled military force. We may not be moving rapidly enough but we passed legislation last year along the lines of the report of the Cordiner committee appointed by President Eisenhower to undertake to make the armed services more attractive as a career so that people would have more training and would stay in it and it would prevent the terrific turnover and the waste that comes through the necessity of having to train men for 2 years of service.

Are there any questions of Congressman Wolf?

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I have one question.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Stennis.

Senator STENNIS. Congressman, you quote General Harold Maddux who said, in May 1958:

We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade the military career in the eyes of the Nation.

We passed the bill on changes in pay. Do you have any light that you could shed as to what effect that has had?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, sir, and that is a good question.

Mr. WOLF. There has been some improvement since the passing of this last legislation, and I think the significant proof of this type of activity is the fact that there has been some improvement. However, the improvement has not occurred as much as it should have I feel in the lower pay grades, encouraging men to stay on over.

Senator STENNIS. I was particularly interested in this. Have you talked to any of these men? I am not interested in statistics just now, but have you talked to any of these men about this pay schedule and the change in it; I mean the men that are in the service?

Mr. WOLF. I have; yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. What was their reaction?

Mr. WOLF. Well, it is significant that after they get about up to the rank of sergeant, their attitude seems to be different than corporals and privates. I think this is important, their attitude toward staying.

Senator STENNIS. I mean their attitude now in the light of the passage of this most recent pay bill. Have you talked to them about the change of attitude, if any, toward staying in?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. That is what I want to get.

Mr. WOLF. May I say, sir, that the thing that seems to be in the minds of many of these men is the fact that it was on a percentage basis, and this has had the feeling of possibly being discriminatory in the lower brackets because it was only \$3 or \$4 for a private and as the pay scale goes up it gets better. The inductee comes in as a buck private or something less, and by the time he would be possibly ready to get into a better pay scale, a little bit better, his time is up, and I am wondering, sir, if maybe a little more attraction here when he gets ready to ship over than 4 or 5 or 6 dollars, whatever the case may be—I was in the Navy and shipped over. I guess in the Army they reenlist. That might possibly have a tendency to keep some of these men.

Senator STENNIS. We are trying to adopt a schedule there going up into the sergeants that would be attractive for this man who has

served his 2 years. We did not try to pay the men serving just 2 years anything additional.

That is not the period anyway that we are trying to keep them in.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, sir; when he is ready to take his second tour of duty.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. WOLF. This is the time when he has the very great decision to make, at this point, whether to make the military his career or——

Senator STENNIS. I understand all that. That is elemental. But what I want to know is what contact have you had with these men since this pay bill passed?

Mr. WOLF. I have had a steady file of military men through my office of all pay grades, sir, since I got here in January, asking them these questions, and I would say that as you get closer to the higher ranks, when you get to the sergeant, and from there on up, their attitude is fine. But it is down below, it is in this first bracket, the privates and the buck sergeants, that there is still some feeling of dissatisfaction, and this is where we have got to make the break if we are going to make career men out of them, right here.

Senator STENNIS. You mean pay them more in this 2-year service period, the initial 2-year service period.

Mr. WOLF. I think maybe a little bit more. If we are going to attract them on some other basis than on the basis of conscription we are going to possibly have to pay them a little more. We are taking them out of a labor market that is paying them much more, but I think more significant than that is at the point where they might want to make the decision to stay in the service or get out, you have got to have something a little more significant to attract them to stay with us.

Senator STENNIS. What do you mean by a little more significant? I was on the subcommittee that handled that pay bill. That is why I want to know this. What has been the reaction? I want to know from someone outside the service, because the service is going to testify as to their viewpoint.

Mr. WOLF. I am aware of that. I would not want to tie it down to figures, sir.

Senator STENNIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any further questions? If not, we are glad to have had you with us, Congressman Wolf.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., who represents the National Guard Association of the United States.

Come around, General Harrison.

Senator SALTONSTALL. General Harrison is a Massachusetts citizen and was adjutant general of the National Guard when I worked with him as a Governor for 6 years.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are very glad to have that statement but I think we would almost take judicial cognizance of the fact that the head man of the National Guard is from Massachusetts and has been for a very long time. He has somehow managed to corner that honor.

**STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM H. HARRISON, JR., PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES**

Gen. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before this committee during its consideration of H.R. 2260, a bill to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provision of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Historically, the National Guard has always supported a system whereby the manpower requirements of the active Armed Forces might be met through an equitable selective distribution of the burden of military service.

Historically, also, the need for such a system has been proven time and again and it is indeed fortunate that the Congress has had the wisdom and the fortitude to provide for its continuance.

With the tremendous advancements in the fields of technology and scientific warfare, many would have us believe that any future conflict will be fought largely with devastating nuclear devices fired by military-scientists from strategically dispersed missile bases.

Others would have us believe that any future war will be won or lost in a matter of hours or, at the most, a few days.

Both assume that the next and only war will be a total war commencing with an all-out nuclear attack and without warning. Both would sacrifice conventional forces and survival training in favor of complete reliance on pushbuttons.

None can foretell the future, but certainly the immediate past and present are indicative that local aggressions and periphery disturbances are integral parts of international life.

Moreover, if the Congress exclusively had supported the preparation of the Nation's Armed Forces for total war when that concept first was advanced several years ago, the conventional forces which fought in Korea, garrisoned our outposts around the world, and landed in Lebanon, would not have been available to us as instruments of our national policy and evidence of our determination to resist aggression.

We cannot afford the luxury of preparing exclusively for a push-button war any more than we can afford to overlook the impact that the development of nuclear weapons has had upon the art of war.

Our Army, Navy, and Air Force are visible evidence to our friends, our allies, those who are neutral, and to our enemies of our national determination to remain alert and strong.

To maintain those forces against any eventuality or character of attack we need and must have the continuation of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

It is a vital ingredient of our military posture and we urge that it be extended.

As a corollary to any action by the Congress to extend the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which will authorize the selection and induction of young men into the active Armed Forces of the Nation for training and service, due consideration should be given to the entire subject of the obligated Reserve period of service imposed on those same young men upon their release from the active forces.

I am certain that the members of this committee well remember the grave injustices created by the recall of veterans and former servicemen for the Korean conflict.

Due to the deflated size of our active forces and the immediate requirement for trained personnel there was no alternative at that time.

It was largely as a result of this distasteful and unfortunate situation that the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 containing significant safeguards against such a recurrence was enacted.

In 1955 the Department of Defense transmitted to the Congress proposed legislation known as the national Reserve plan for the purpose of vastly increasing the size and effectiveness of the Reserve Forces. This proposal resulted in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

It was in the national Reserve plan that the so-called 6 months' active-duty training program was first advanced. It was designed to provide a means of increasing the strength and capability of the Reserve forces from among young men who voluntarily entered that program, thereby assuming a protracted period of obligated Reserve component service and a greater degree of vulnerability for recall.

The national Reserve plan established 1959 as the target date for the tremendous strength increases in the Reserve forces. However, limitations on the numbers permitted to enter the 6-month program precluded the attainment of these strength goals by that means alone. Additional sources of manpower had to be made available.

Accordingly, the Department proposed that all persons released from active service subsequent to the Korean conflict be required to enter the Ready Reserve of the Reserve forces and participate therein for a period.

It was this committee which recognized the inequities inherent in such a proposal and thereupon modified the retrospective aspects of the plan by providing that such Reserve participation obligation be imposed only on those who entered the Armed Forces after the date of enactment of the legislation.

Shortly after selling the Congress on the need for the greatly expanded Reserve forces called for in the national Reserve plan the Department of Defense reversed its stand and programed wholesale cutbacks in the Reserve forces.

Reductions were accomplished exclusively through limitations imposed upon the numbers of young men permitted to enter the 6-month training program while at the same time extensive use was made of returning servicemen and veterans who were subject to the Reserve participation obligation.

It is evident that such action was never contemplated by this committee. It is equally evident that with the reduced numbers authorized to enter into the 6 months' active duty training program the Reserve forces will soon consist almost entirely of veterans and prior servicemen.

If this situation is permitted to continue we could duplicate on an even larger scale the injustices of the Korean recall. The Reserve components have heretofore been considered a volunteer force but under the present trend we may look forward to an almost wholly conscript Reserve force.

Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that the authority to induct men into the active Armed Forces now contained in the Universal Mili-

tary Training and Service Act must be extended. However, we are equally convinced that the inequities arising from existing law should be corrected. To do otherwise is to compound the injustices.

We urge that this committee give serious consideration to—

(1) Repeal of that provision of law which requires those who have served at least 2 years in the active Armed Forces to participate in Ready Reserve training;

(2) Reduction of the Ready Reserve obligation for such persons who voluntarily join Ready Reserve units which are required to perform at least 48 unit training assemblies and 15 days of active duty training annually; and

(3) Expansion of the 6 months' active duty training program to permit a greater number of young men to assume a military obligation and participate in the service of their country.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am very much interested in your statement, General Harrison. It so happens that I was the author of the amendment which did away with the ex post facto aspects of the Reserve liability in the act to which you refer, and it is quite a coincidence that I had already directed the staff to investigate and prepare an amendment along the lines that you suggest.

The matter has been in my mind for some time, that the Department of Defense, as you state, in either 1955 or 1956—

Gen. HARRISON. In 1955, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. And led us to believe that we had to pass a great many laws to expand the Reserve and place a great deal more dependence on the Reserve than ever before in our military history. The Congress accepted that thesis and we passed laws along that line, but the laws had not been codified before they reversed their field and started in the other direction. Since that time they have continued to cut back, which we have become accustomed to in the Reserve forces, not only in the National Guard but in the Organized Reserve. There is a great problem in this country to attempt to equalize the obligation that every citizen owes to serve in the military forces and to make his contribution to our national security. We have this tremendous machinery of the draft now and we must maintain it, but it is just gathering up a handful each month at the present time, though, of course, it does stimulate enlistments in the other elements of the military services that give it an impact far beyond that which appears on the surface. But not only is there an injustice on those that have already served in being required to do the Reserve duty, but there is, I don't like this word "discrimination," but a degree of discrimination between them because a great many of them are assigned to Reserve units and compelled to serve, and others, where there is no unit available, go scot free and don't have to participate at all in the program.

So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation. Any questions of your fellow citizen from Massachusetts?

Senator SALTONSTALL. You say questions of my fellow citizen. I know I will get good answers so therefore I will ask questions.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask General Harrison this question: You state here that you want to repeal the provision of the law which makes those who have had at least 2 years in the active Armed Forces participate in Ready Reserve training.

Then under two you say: "Reduction of the Ready Reserve obligation for those who voluntarily join Ready Reserve units."

Now, if you are going to take those men who have served 2 years who are well-trained, take them out and not make them participate in Ready Reserve training, shouldn't you maintain the obligation for those who come in so that we will have a better trained force?

Gen. HARRISON. What I intended to say here, Senator, was in the first instance those that are either inducted or enlist in the active service. They are required now to mandatorily participate if assigned. I say first they should not be mandatorily required. It should be a voluntary thing on their part if they want to participate.

The second recommendation was that if they participate voluntarily, that the period now required, 2 years, be reduced back. I would not reduce too much of the period of service for the young man that avails himself of satisfactorily performing military service by going through the 6-month training program.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Then these first two points, heading toward repeal and reduction, apply only to those people who have had 2 years of service?

Gen. HARRISON. Two years or more.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I didn't read that into your second paragraph there. I think that ought to be made clear.

Gen. HARRISON. Yes, that is what the intent is on it. It is for those that have been inducted for 2 years or that have enlisted in the Active Reserve.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that your second point does not apply to the young men who are taking the 6 months' training?

Gen. HARRISON. No.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You say the expansion of the 6 months' active duty training program under three.

Has that program been filled up within your knowledge? Is it completely full?

Gen. HARRISON. I am happy that the Senator asked that question. It gives me an opportunity to put on the record the fact that although the Congress last year in the case of the National Guard set the strength of the guard at 400,000 and provided for 55,000, 6-month trainees, since the beginning of this present fiscal year we have not been able to maintain the 400,000 strength because only 44,000 of the authorized 55,000 6-month trainees, have been made available to the States.

Eleven thousand of them have been withheld by the Department of Defense. In every State, Senator, there is a waiting list of young men, in practically every unit, of young men desirous of enlisting and participating in the 6 months' training program. We cannot enlist them in the units or within the States unless we have a quota allocated to the State by the Department of Army through the Bureau.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Then as to that it is a quota problem? It is not a financial problem?

Gen. HARRISON. It is a quota problem, and I would suppose that, yes, there was a financial problem on the thing in that perhaps there was

not sufficient funds available. A year ago when the Appropriation Act was before the Congress, we knew that there were insufficient moneys contained in there for the support of the guard at that strength because there was no consideration given to additional moneys that would be needed because of military pay increases granted by the Congress, and also because of civilian pay that was granted.

There were no provisions in the Appropriation Act for that. Now I suppose that the reason for the withholding of these 11,000 trainees is twofold. First, they don't have the sufficient funds to fund it, and secondly, maybe the Department of Army may not have the necessary personnel to train them.

Senator SALTONSTALL. How large is the National Guard at the present time throughout the country?

Gen. HARRISON. The last strength report for January 31 was about 390,000, 389,000-some-odd.

That is just the Army.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Could you answer that again?

Gen. HARRISON. 839,000-odd is in the Army National Guard.

Senator SALTONSTALL. What you would like to do then would be to have this committee consider very seriously amending, when they extend the draft act, some of these reserve forces provisions.

Gen. HARRISON. Amending the section which requires mandatory participation. It would broaden the base of trained individuals if men coming off at least 2 years' active duty did not have to participate and be part of the drilling units, giving them an opportunity to adjust in civilian life. It would give a broader base of young men, of young ages, who would desire to go into this program, take the 6 months' training and then perform the rest of their military obligation in training units.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Do you think that the 6 months' training program as you have seen it works out, with the modern type of weapons and the complexity of these weapons, gives enough training to a man so that he can readily pick it up if he has to?

Gen. HARRISON. From what I know and what I have observed from lads that have returned from the 6 months' training program, it is a very excellent program. I am not going to state that each man that comes back is completely trained in the various phases that he will be assigned to later in his military unit.

There are some MOS's that will require further school training, but a great impetus has been added in the state of readiness of the National Guard and our reserve forces because of this 6 months' training.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Just one final question: Do you have any knowledge of the quality of the young men who are taking this 6 months' training course? Have they got a pretty high IQ, and will they make good soldiers?

Gen. HARRISON. From what I have observed in Massachusetts, yes, Senator. They are above the standards that we have enlisted in the guard in years past. Practically all of them, in fact all of them, are high school graduates and a great many of them are college graduates.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARTLETT. In your statement you said—

Shortly after selling the Congress on the need for the greatly expanded reserve forces called for in the National Reserve plan, the Department of Defense reversed its stand and programed wholesale cutbacks in the reserve forces.

That appears on the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4 of your statement. Do you have any information or ideas of your own as to why this change took place?

Gen. HARRISON. No, I don't know the reason behind it. I only know from reading back again in the records of the testimony of the Defense Department in its testimony before this committee and before the House said that the Armed Forces would need 2,980,000 in the Active Forces, a reserve force in being, a Ready Reserve, drilling units of 2,900,000, and 2 million in the Standby Reserve, and as of a year and a half ago they started to reduce, I know in the Army Guards and I know the same is true on the Army Reserves.

Senator BARTLETT. You just don't know why?

Gen. HARRISON. I don't know why.

Senator BARTLETT. And I assume you would not know why either they placed this limit say upon the young men permitted to enter the 6-months training program but instead placed in the reserve the returning servicemen and veterans.

Gen. HARRISON. The only reason I gather from my own interpretation is probably the dollar reason. If they have to train more 6-months trainees, it will cost additional money and this assignment, this mandatory assignment of the 2- and 3-year man, why it doesn't cost any money.

Senator BARTLETT. Thank you, General. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you very kindly for your appearance here. I understand Representative Coad has now come in. We called you first, Representative Coad, when you were not present. We will give you an opportunity to testify now if you wish.

STATEMENT OF HON. MERWIN COAD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. COAD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regret I was delayed slightly. I had a roomful of constituents who came in at the last minute and they had a rather high priority.

Mr. Chairman, and member of this committee, I appear before you today not as an expert in the field of military personnel needs, but rather as a citizen and a Member of the other body who feels that the extension of the draft law as it stands today would continue an unhealthy situation which works an injustice upon the thousands and thousands of our young men of draft age.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I have here a copy of the technicality of an amendment about which I am discussing that I would like to make available to you or at least to the clerk.

I favor and voted for the extension of the draft law in the House. But my vote on H.R. 2260 did not represent a full endorsement of all of the provisions of the act. The Universal Military Training and Service Act as amended now holds a young man subject to draft call

during the years between his 18th and his 26th birthday. In other words, our young men here in America in time of peace or at least in the absence of a hot war, are held and bound to military conscription for a period of 8 years. The tragedy of this is that these 8 years are the most important 8 years of a man's life, which are normally filled enough with uncertainties and moments of indecision so common to this traditional period between the twilight of boyhood and the dawn of manhood. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there was no question about the need for this provision in the draft law at the time of its original passage.

Our country was faced with a great need for military personnel. Yet we are faced with a lack of facilities to take on each new crop of eligibles, and therefore, we have had to spread this period of eligibility over a number of years.

This fairly fitted the needs of our country and the conscription program at that time regardless of the many far-reaching consequences on our American way of life. I ask you as I have asked myself: We assume an extension of the draft law will be necessary, but is it necessary that our young men be held subject to the draft for 8 years? Is it still necessary today to disregard to this degree the individual's rights and privileges as granted by our Constitution? I have concluded that this provision of the act is outdated by present-day circumstances and is asking too much, and for that reason I propose a modification of the appropriate provisions of the act through an amendment to H.R. 2260, a copy of which you have in your hands, which would reduce to 3 years the period a young man is subject to the draft.

This amendment in effect would change the age requirements from a period of 18 to 26 to 18 to 21. I believe that this new age limitation would still permit a workable draft law while affording relief from the uncertainties of a prolonged period of eligibility to the young men of draft age. I believe that adoption of such an amendment would be in keeping with public acceptance of any extension of the draft due to the uncertainties of the world situation. Further, I believe that adoption of my proposal would be a step toward demonstrating sincere and consistent efforts in emphasizing education after high school.

The adoption of this amendment would reduce the percentage of college graduates who are annually faced with the uncertainties of military service. Today this is an undue hardship on our young men as well as their prospective employers. We must consider and evaluate the impact of the draft on the whole picture of our national strength.

I urge you to give your most serious thought to this problem and to my suggested amendment which would help make the draft act more fair and acceptable. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If there are any questions I would be glad to attempt an answer.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are very glad to have your views. Congressman Coad. Are there any questions of Congressman Coad?

Senator SALTONSTALL?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I just ask this one question: Congressman, does that mean that the people who have already been inducted, we will say, and have served their 2 years will be released if they have gone beyond their 21st birthday or will be released on their 21st birthday?

Mr. COAD. No; that does not have anything to do with any release date. It means only that a young man is subject to the call of the draft between his 18th and his 21st birthday.

You see, ostensibly he could be drafted under this amendment 1 day prior to his 21st birthday and still go on and serve the allotted period of time for which he has been drafted.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You have got in there that after the enactment of this proviso.

Now, what I am trying to find out is: Does that apply to men who are taken in prior to the proviso?

Mr. COAD. No; it does not.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Should it not?

Mr. COAD. I had not held that it would because of the fact that that would make it *ex post facto*, in my opinion.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I don't want to take too much time, but wouldn't that mean this: Assume my son was 18, 3 years ago, and he had served his 2 years and was still in subject to this reserve for another 6 years, and your son came in after the proviso. He would be released when he was 21. He would be released after 3 years. I should think if you were going to have a proviso like this it should provide for men who were in prior to it rather than after it.

It is the reverse of what Senator Russell was saying to one of the previous witnesses, I think your colleague, that he was responsible, and as I recall he was, for the enactment of the provision that men should be required to serve only who were inducted after the passage of the act.

Now you are releasing him from service and it seems to me if you are going to release him from service and make that service shorter, you have got to have it apply to men before as well as after. I just want to raise that question.

Mr. COAD. I am not sure that we are actually in the same train of thought here. What I am talking about is only the period during which they can be drafted. It has nothing to do after they are drafted.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Yes, but what I want to say is this: Supposing they became 18 to 21 before this proviso was put in. Then you say they can't be drafted after they are 21.

Mr. COAD. That is right, upon the date of the enactment.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, it would apply to people who became 18 we will say prior to the proviso as well as after.

Mr. COAD. Yes; that is right.

Chairman RUSSELL. In other words, every person who is past 21 at the time of the enactment of this bill would be home free as far as his obligations to the draft is concerned.

Mr. COAD. That is right; it would move it back from 26 to 21.

Chairman RUSSELL. For whatever reason he might have been deferred, he would from thence forth be home free.

Mr. COAD. You see this still extends the deferment period. This extends it to 26, whereas now if he has been deferred up to the point of 26, then his age of eligibility for the draft goes to 35. This reduces that from 35 back to 26.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is right, but if he had taken some unusual educational course the draft would have to call him in before he got

to 26 or if he got to 26 while on deferment he would be exempt from service.

Mr. COAD. That is right, the same as previously it was age 35.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is right. Are there any further questions? Senator Bartlett?

Senator BARTLETT. No questions.

(The amendment to H.R. 2260 follows:)

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:
 "That (a) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "twenty-six" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-one."

(b) Section 4(a) of such Act is amended by striking out '26 years' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '21 years'; and by striking out 'twenty-sixth anniversary' in the last paragraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-first anniversary.'

"(c) Paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Act are amended by striking out 'twenty-six years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-one years.'

"(d) The second sentence of paragraph (3) of section 4(d) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That after the enactment of this proviso, this sentence shall apply only with respect to persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed as described herein before their twenty-first birthday.'

"(e) Clauses (A) and (C) of paragraph (2) of section 6(c) of such Act are each amended by striking out 'twenty-eighth' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-sixth.'

"(f) The third proviso of section 6(h) of such Act is amended by striking out 'thirty-fifth' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-sixth.'

"(g) Section 16(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'twenty-six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-one' and by striking out 'twenty-sixth' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-first.'"

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Mr. John C. Estey, Jr., who is associate dean of Amherst College.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, you have a great deal to say about certain colleges in Massachusetts. This is a very distinguished college of which this gentleman is the associate dean.

Chairman RUSSELL. I understand that Amherst is a very distinguished college, and I have not had nearly so much to say about another great college located in Massachusetts as one who is an eminent alumnus, and a member of this committee.

All right, Mr. Estey.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. ESTEY, JR., ASSOCIATE DEAN, AMHERST COLLEGE

Mr. ESTEY. I served 2 years and 3 months with the U.S. Air Force in the Korean war. I am now a captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. My civilian occupation is education. I am associate dean in Amherst College in Massachusetts. In this last capacity I act as military aid adviser to our students. From this vantage point I would like to convey to you some idea of the effect of the draft on college students. I would like to make one or two comments on the effects of the draft on alumni generally. I would then like to place these problems alongside another problem, the teacher shortage, and hopefully explain how I think a solution might be reached on both sides working within the framework of a Selective Service System.

In my experience in counseling some thousand students on how to relate military service to their life plans, I think I could characterize

their reaction to the draft as one of uncertainty, inequity—and I am sorry to have to repeat these words to get this—frustration and demoralization. These students are uncertain when they will be called, if at all. They are uncertain about how to plan for graduate school or business when there is a 50-50 chance that they won't be called at all.

They sense the inequity involved when they see friends with the money and inclination to go on to graduate school planning to stay deferred until age 26 when they will be freemen. They sense the inequity in the indefinite deferment of their friends who precipitate marriage and having a family, often with the sole purpose of avoiding the draft. They realize that the long Active Reserve requirements active duty just compound the disadvantage of getting called.

They are frustrated in their attempts to find workable alternatives. The 6 months' program is saturated almost everywhere. To go into flying necessitates a 5-year commitment. They are frustrated in their thoughts of Reserve duty by the reports of their fellows who sit through boring irrelevant meetings each week.

They are frustrated by the difficulty in relating their training and education to specific jobs in the service of their country. The result of all this is a serious and increasing demoralization and a corruption of their sense of duty. If it is true that raw manpower is still needed in great numbers by the Armed Forces, this message does not get through to the college student. He does not see why he is needed. He reads about the competition with Russia in the areas of research, technology, engineering, economics, culture, and he wonders why his brains and training are not as valuable as his feet and back.

Finally he sees so many men being deferred for apparently flimsy reasons that he is bound to say, "How shall I get out of it?" rather than "How shall I serve?"

These doubts and difficulties could be resolved if the Selective Service System had more places to utilize the huge surplus of manpower they have under their control so that a higher percentage of young men would be serving in one fashion or another.

They could be resolved if there were a better system of utilizing the trained talent which now drains systematically out of the manpower pool. Each year about 300,000 fathers escape the draft.

Each year about 20,000 men, many highly trained in graduate study escape the year. Each year 500,000 men are classified IV-F though many of these have talents and abilities even though lodged in infirm bodies. In other words, each year an estimated 150,000 men of potential talent are escaping the draft because there is no way to use their abilities.

At this point I would like to bring in the teacher shortage. I won't dwell on statistics because the whole business is a bit tiresome by now. It is enough to say that our best studies show we will need as teachers half the graduates of all our colleges in the next 10 years. That is 200,000 men a year. Presently we are getting about 50,000 teachers a year. We must have an additional 150,000 people going into teaching each year.

But this is impossible under present conditions. We can't even come close. There is only one source currently untapped for potential

teachers, and that I submit is the Selective Service System, and I might point out that I have estimated the need per year which we are currently not getting at 150,000, and this is exactly the amount I would estimate drain out of the Selective Service System that we cannot get hold of or do not right now, who are people of potential talent who would make potential teachers. With the advent of the sputnik it became clear that education and training was a major weapon in national defense.

Congress recognized the relationship in the title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Admiral Rickover, whose own finely honed intellectual talents and imagination led to our first nuclear submarine, has crusaded recently not for more men or larger military service but for better schools.

It would seem logical therefore to make teaching an extension of national service and permit young men to satisfy their obligation in a teaching position at whatever level they are able to find a job and for a specified period of time, say 3 years. Under pressure of the draft, it would be possible to challenge large numbers of men with the training and talent to become potentially good teachers.

Many of those who are now escaping the draft entirely by being over 26, fathers, or physically unqualified, channel these men directly into positions of usefulness in terms of national defense.

The relief valve to the presently unmanageable surplus thereby created would eliminate many of the inequities which are now a function of too many men with too few places to utilize them.

The proposal is not radical for there is plenty of precedent for exempting certain groups and providing alternate service. Ministers, for example, are exempt from military service. Conscientious objectors may serve as medical guinea pigs and in hospitals. Workers in essential industry are deferred as long as they remain essential, although this is not strictly alternate service.

Teachers of science can be deferred and will not be drafted at all if they teach until age 26. It must be said that the draft law is at least this flexible, and some order may be brought out of the impending chaos by executive action. But these groups, the ministers, teachers of science, comprise only some thousands annually while the teaching alternative service which I am proposing would involve perhaps several hundred thousand men each year. This should probably be the province of Congress to sanction. The proposal has these features of the one, the Selective Service System would be retained for its value in providing military inductees and volunteers and for readiness in case of sudden large-scale need.

Two, no great increase in administrative machinery is necessary. The procedure for reporting alternative service already exists, that is alternate service in essential industries for example. An approved list of institutions at which teaching could be credited is available from the Veterans' Administration and regional accrediting agencies. A man who has taught for 3 academic years at an approved institution could be considered to have discharged his service obligation.

Three, if the number of vacancies now existing and projected in our schools and colleges were filled by alternate service teachers and there are more than enough trained talent men in the draft pool to do this then it would be possible for all young men except the physically and

mentally unqualified, who might be used in civil defense, to fill some sort of obligated service. This would meet the universal concept and ease the democratic conscience.

Four, many more trained minds could be utilized in the defense effort than at present at no extra cost to the Government.

Five, the chance is provided for wholesale recruitment of potential teachers many of whom would hopefully be permanently captured for the profession.

Six, with more applicants than vacancies the teaching profession could raise standards all along the line. If a prospective applicant did not qualify or found that there were no vacancies available, he would simply then be inducted for military service or to try one of the other alternatives. There are a number of objections to this proposal all of them I think answerable.

It is dangerous to force people to teach. Quite true, but I have talked with many college students about the plan and almost unanimously they would feel so grateful for the chance to use their education and settle their plans that they would give maximum effort gladly.

It is not a good idea to recruit teachers on a temporary basis. There is always this risk anyway, and thousands of young women just out of college enter teaching with every likelihood of leaves for marriage and a home after a few years.

Isn't this a case of special rewards for a privileged class? Yes, but we have provided for the opportunity of any American for the urge and the brains to go to college and it is certainly more democratic I think than the privileged class who now escape the draft completely.

If you provide alternate service for teachers, why not for social workers, foreign service, and so forth? I would argue on this that social conscience, social service, the Foreign Service, all are a function of education. They depend on education and teachers, and so I would say that teachers are the bedrock for these other kinds of social agencies.

The defense of this country rests fundamentally, I think, on two great systems, the one for enlisting talent in its service, the other for developing that talent. I think both systems are now inadequate and can only deteriorate in the future.

A relatively simple act of Congress could transform the weakness of one into the strength of the other.

DRAFT DODGER OR PATRIOT?

(By John C. Esty, Jr.¹)

For the next few months, college seniors will be focusing their thoughts on how to find a proper place in a society which needs their talents desperately. The most frustrating barrier to this important process is the military manpower situation. Although the draft procedures are complex, it is not complexity that creates the problem for the students. The simple fact is that seniors are required to cope with Defense Department policies that are unimaginative, extemporary, unrealistic, and inadequate, even for military purposes. A few examples, drawn from my experience as military-service adviser at Amherst, will illustrate the point:

I recognize him as one of our more alert seniors as he walks in and sits down in the chair by my desk. He has made a good record in college and holds great promise for a meaningful life. He comes right to the point: "I want to go to

¹ John C. Esty, Jr., is associate dean at Amherst College and a captain in the Air Force Reserve.

law school, but I think I should work for a year or two to get some perspective on law as a career. What are my chances of getting drafted during that time?"

This same question, the same slight frown, I have heard and seen hundreds of times. The reply is also the same. "You'll probably get called within about a year after graduation. Wouldn't this be a good way to get some perspective and at the same time serve your military obligation?"

"Perhaps, but I'd hoped to work in a law office and anyway I want to get married in June. I don't want to drag my wife all over the country, especially when the housing is supposedly so bad around Army camps. What do you think I should do? Go to law school right away and hope for deferment?"

Shall I tell him he shouldn't get married? That married life for a buck private isn't so bad? That he should go right to law school to dodge the draft, even though he's not sure it's the right field for him? This would work, of course, but maybe it would be as much of a timewaste as the Army. I'd better just pull out the stock answer: "Why don't you wait and see what Congress does, or perhaps there will be another Executive order changing the ground rules again. Better not make plans now."

The next boy is also a senior—and married already. He has a good job in the executive-training program of a large industrial firm. Now he finds his farsightedness and assiduity rewarded by the prospect of military service, which will upset his plans completely. He wants to know if it's true that fathers are virtually draft free. When I confirm this, he shrugs his shoulders: "Well, we don't have any money and we thought we should wait on a family. But if fathers get out of military service, then I'll become a father."

Once during course registration—a time when our students typically make some attempt at relating their curricular choices to a future goal—a boy came to me with a neat scheme. Out of a generally versatile academic background, he was emerging with a clear talent in classical studies, perhaps headed for teaching or writing. This was the type of person a society must enlist to look backward and soak up the past, to carry along accumulations of wisdom, cultural tradition, and ethics; the kind who may not help to build missiles, but might help decide whether it's right to use them. He wanted to see the list of critical occupations for which draft exemption and reduction of Reserve requirements are offered. He didn't find classical studies. He did find physics—and that's what he's majoring in.

Shall we call it lack of patriotism? Are these spineless or cynical young men of the "silent," "cautious" generation, who don't care about their country? I think not. Listen to the Amherst Student editorializing on the campus visit of Marine officers recruiting for the platoon leaders course:

"We read daily how the intermediate range ballistic missile is now obsolete, how manpower is being slashed, and draft calls are dwindling. Why then sacrifice 3 years and two summers to the USMC when, with a little effort and information, it is possible to fulfill a military obligation in less than a year, with a Reserve commitment which can be waived for men that are entering critical skills occupations in fields of chemistry, physics, geology, and foreign languages? It is possible to enroll in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 6 months' program in a rural area where there is no filled quota of reservists, go on active duty after graduation, and go to work with no Reserve commitment except in case of war, when all reservists are called by act of Congress. The military obligation can be fulfilled more easily than by a 3-year hitch with the Marine Corps. A contribution to the security of our country can better be made in a research lab than by participation in obsolete field maneuvers at some obscure military outpost."

What particular lecture on American democracy and patriotism do you give to the boy who, having been dressed down for asking directly how to avoid the draft, wonders, "I see so many getting out of it, why should I be the one to go?" You point out that there have always been inequities in manpower conscription; that the burden of Korea fell at first on the reservists of World War II, and that this is why Congress changed from "selective service" (service by just those selected) to "universal service" (where everyone serves, at least in theory); that war has always consumed those most valuable to society in any sense. But he smiles and asks, "Is the senior who goes to graduate school just to get out of military service universal? Is the father universal? Is it universal to be the one sucker in four who gets hooked?"

And it's not just getting hooked that hurts; it's also staying hooked. Consider the story of the boy who applied for admission to us 5 years after graduation from high school. He had wanted to go to a challenging, eastern men's

college, but had no money at all. So he went to work as a patternmaker, which carried an "essential skills" draft deferment. For 5 years he put money aside for his education, spending some of it along the way on night school courses, mainly to prepare himself even better for college. When he came to be interviewed, we found he was a boy of high ability and one highly motivated to work hard. We accepted him on the spot and offered him a partial scholarship to augment his own savings. It was the kind of case that makes an admission officer, in the midst of his harassment, feel the whole business is worthwhile.

The boy went home elated, quit his job, and enrolled in some summer school courses we thought would help him in preparation for entrance in September. A week later he was on the phone—with his induction notice in hand. He was not eligible for student deferment, since he was actually not in college, so I counseled him to try the 6-month program. We would let him enter in February and there was a local Reserve unit where he could continue his 5½-year Reserve obligation. He followed this advice and came to us at mid-year. His academic record has borne out our expectation; he has attended his Reserve meetings faithfully. Hear his dilemma:

"We have training meetings two evenings a week, since the unit is geared to the academic year, and we are then free during school vacations. The trouble is that I have to study hard—you know I'm on scholarship—and two evenings shot each week is a lot. I would apply for a waiver of the 48 meetings required per year in return for an extra 2 weeks of summer camp (2 weeks is required anyway), but then I don't get my summer job. A lot of men don't show up half the time and nothing seems to happen; I just don't dare. Do you know what we do at these meetings? We sit. We listen to a halting personal account of supply operations in the Panama Canal Zone, a lecture on military administration, or a talk on Pentagon organization. Sometimes we stand up and do a few 'column lefts' and 'dress rights.' I don't know what all this has to do with missiles, strategic warfare or even landings in Lebanon. And I've got 4 more years of it."

These are the kinds of stories and problems a collegiate military-service adviser hears days after day. The advice we must give adds up to something like this: don't plan—wait; become a father sooner than you had planned; go to graduate school even though you're not ready; pick your college major after consulting the draft-exempt list. Any dean or counselor who gives that kind of counsel would ordinarily be fired for incompetency, yet this is what the present military manpower policies are forcing us to do. We had always tried to proceed from one cardinal principle of advice: Do your planning now, as though there were no threat of military service; then see how the service best fits into your plans, and act accordingly.

This idea seemed to be useful during Korea and up to about 2 years ago. Then the effects of three major changes in atmosphere went to work on the side of confusion.

First, our students read regularly about the great shifts to technological-defense weapons, which are manned by engineers instead of by armies. The "brush-fire" argument for many divisions of standing infantry was undermined by the small number of men involved in Lebanon. They can't help but wonder why so many men, especially unskilled draftees, are needed. (Nor can I; my bias must be showing by now.)

Second, unlike 6 years ago, education seemed to have gained respectability so that, as the student editorial quoted earlier suggests, it should be as patriotic to develop one's mind and intellectual talents as to serve as clerk-typist in company headquarters. If Congress is willing to appropriate enough money for a National Defense Education Act (inadequate though it is, especially in strengthening public school teaching), doesn't it make sense to let intelligent people serve with their brains instead of their feet—and at no cost to taxpayers?

Finally, the most demoralizing shift in climate has been the manifest breakdown of the Selective Service System in maintaining any semblance of universality; that is, a sense of fairness as to who is drafted and who isn't. It is this aspect of military service which has led the Fund for the Republic, in a paper by John Graham entitled "The Universal Military Obligation," to question seriously the constitutionality of current manpower practices. Excerpted in numerous college newspapers, this paper clearly articulates the inequities which students feel as they try to plan their futures. The only course open to one charged with providing advice on military service is to point to the few fixed rules which may indicate some guide to planning. One simply answers four main questions in the minds of college students: What are the current obligations? What is

the present status of the draft? What are the alternatives? What are the chances that all this will change?

The first obligation is that every male must register with the Selective Service System on his 18th birthday. Most colleges have some official designated as a local draft registrar for the convenience of students. Sometime after registration, the registrar is required to fill out a questionnaire on the basis of which he is usually classified 1A by his local board. This classification means he is available for service until such time as he receives a deferment for academic, physical, or other reasons. It is customary for students to hold the 1A classification throughout their college careers unless granted a student deferment by their local board (some boards grant deferments automatically). At the present time, students are rarely drafted much below the age of 23. A registrant is additionally obliged to inform his board of any address change (including college attended), any change of status, any plans to leave the country, and to carry his draft card at all times.

The law from which these obligations arise is the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, extended in 1955 by Congress until June 1959. It requires all physically qualified males between the ages of 18½ and 26 to serve 2 years of active duty and 4 years of Reserve duty—or some administrative equivalent such as 6 months' active duty and 5½ years' active Reserve duty. Those who have received a deferment have their liability age extended from 26 to 35.

Currently any male who is physically qualified—apparently about 40 percent of any age group fails to qualify—and who is not eligible for deferment (as a student, as a father, as a person with dependents, as a ministerial or medical candidate) may expect to be drafted between the ages of 22 and 23. Doctors and dentists may be deferred because of their professional training, but they then become eligible for a special draft—or the alternative of accepting a commission for 2 years of active duty—until age 45. In most cases, it is possible for a student to complete 4 years of college untouched by the draft, but graduate school almost certainly requires deferment. The student deferment is still based on a student's score on the college qualification test and on his academic rank.

Even though receipt of a deferment technically makes a student eligible for the draft until he is 35, the Armed Forces are not interested in inductees over the age of 26. By Executive order, local boards are required to exhaust all of the men in each category in the following sequence:

1. Delinquents (i.e., "legal" draft-dodgers).
2. Volunteers (in the order in which they volunteered).
3. Nonvolunteers, nonfathers between 18½ and 26 (oldest first).
4. Nonvolunteer fathers between 18½ and 26 (oldest first).
5. Men over 26.

Many draft boards are filling their quotas entirely from category 2, and the typical board is operating in category 3 at the 23-year-old level. The fact that these categories have been established to begin with, the fact that the age of probable drafting in category 3 is rising, the fact that the number of men in categories 4 and 5 is increasing dramatically, the fact that draft quotas are dwindling—all point to a huge and growing manpower pool with which the system cannot cope. The result is that more and more legally eligible men are escaping the draft and the bankruptcy of the "universal" concept becomes clear.

Being drafted—or volunteering, to precipitate the issue—currently involves 2 years of active service in the Army, which for a college graduate holds fair hope of useful activity (in spite of the "round hole—square peg" stories). This is followed by a 2-year stint in the Ready Reserve, where active participation is supposedly enforced by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, and a final 2 years in the Standby Reserve, which carries no special obligations except in case of general mobilization.

The first alternative to the draft which seems to occur to most college students is complete escape. The attraction of this avenue is directly proportional to the odds involved, which means it's looking better and better all the time. Aside from this unfortunate consequence of current policy, the most popular alternative seems to be the 6-month program. The main advantage is clearly the shortened active-duty time; the disadvantages are the long active-reserve period of 5½ years and the fairly useless nature of the total 6 years' activity. It is likely that before long this program will reach its saturation point; already seniors find that their local Reserve units have reached the allotted strength and can accept no more applications.

The second most attractive alternative, especially for those who want to be officers and are willing to give up an extra year or so for the privilege, would be one of the officer-candidate schools of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. After graduation, the candidate completes 16 weeks of training, 3 years of active duty, and some combinations of Ready and Standby Reserve time for a total of 6 years. A similar program, the Marine platoon leaders course, substitutes two 6-week summer encampments during college for the post-college 16 weeks' training course, and commissions are awarded at graduation from college. Those seniors who might be interested in becoming aviation cadets are scared off by a 5-year active-duty commitment.

For some reason, there is great reluctance on the part of the Armed Forces to appoint officers directly on the basis of education, background, or civilian skills. When I went through officer-training school, the students came from three sources: Direct appointment (my own category), ROTC, and appointment from the enlisted ranks. At the end of the course, the overall evaluation of each man—including military bearing, drill, leadership—was averaged for each source. The direct appointees, with no prior military experience, ranked significantly higher than the ROTC people and enlisted appointees, who followed in that order.

Various special programs for enlisted men create some interest for the college senior. Opportunities for specialized training—as at the Army Language School—are occasionally considered worthwhile enough to warrant spending an extra year of active duty. There is also the possibility of securing an officer-candidate school appointment directly from the ranks, although this is a real gamble. From time to time one hears of a special quick opening program of particular advantage for the college graduate, but these are announced softly and usually last only a short while, so capitalizing on them is a matter of luck.

The alternatives mentioned above are considered mainly by students whose college does not have a Reserve officers training course (ROTC). Where such a program is available, the military obligations of those students not anxious to "take a chance on the draft" are comfortably attended to. But here again the dean, or military counselor, is placed in the position of advising boys to give up a fourth or a fifth of their college work just for the short-range assurance of knowing how and when they will discharge their military obligations. Typically, an ROTC student sacrifices the impractical or nonvocational courses, such as music appreciation and literature, which might have opened the way for years of leisure time richly and meaningfully spent; or political science, which might have engendered a greater sensitivity to the demands placed on an enlightened citizenry.

What are the chances that all this will change? The current draft law expires in June 1959, and Congress will have to act on new legislation this spring. It is apparent that the present situation will no longer be tenable after a few more months. Every executive action in the past 4 years has been directed at relieving the pressure of the manpower pool on the draft apparatus by creating more attractive alternatives. (Two years ago the Defense Department published a booklet, "It's Your Choice," listing more than 40 kinds of opportunities for military service.) Yet the monster grows each day. With the failure of these relief valves, the drafting age within category 3 will probably continue to rise until perhaps no one will be drafted except those who volunteer for service to avoid being drafted. The only way out of this paradox, under present law, would be to defer and exempt greater numbers, which would serve only to increase the present uncertainty and inequity. A particularly unfortunate aspect of the situation is the apparent unwillingness or inability of manpower officials to face these manifest breakdowns in the justification and operation of universal military service. Having talked with a number of these officials, directly and indirectly, I would guess that the Defense Department will simply recommend continuation of the present draft law.

I am aware that our military manpower policy has been criticized on the bases of unconstitutionality, inadequacy, waste, and expense. It should be. But about these grounds I am not especially informed, and can only grumble. I do know, however, of the draft law's effect on college students, and if they are considered to be an important segment of the society, then someone had better pay attention to their perspective. From that perspective, the status quo is absolutely unviable, the corruption of universal service is corrupting their sense of duty, uncertainty is making cynics of them, and their talents and training are deliberately turned from the service of their country.

It is not yet stylish to be unpatriotic, but the college student can't hold out forever.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Estey, you have presented an interesting point of view. I regret that you did not have many more copies of your statement, so that we could have followed it a little more closely. I might say in passing you are very fortunate to have such a distinguished and powerful representative on this committee to permit you to be heard without submitting the statements.

Senator SALTONSTALL ran this committee for so long that even though the vicissitudes of application put me here as chairman, we still let him have his way in most matters.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, I just simply say I am glad that little sentence is going on the record.

Chairman RUSSELL. You know, of course, that teachers at the present time are deferred. There has not been a teacher drafted for 5 years, one who is actually teaching now.

Mr. ESTEY. Yes, sir. I thought that was limited mostly to teachers of science.

Chairman RUSSELL. No; I don't think any teacher of any kind.

Mr. ESTEY. Actually that does not quite jibe with my own experience in some of these cases. The difficulty with that, sir, I would submit is that they must stay in teaching until they are 26, and for a lot of them getting out of college this may mean 4 or 5 years.

Chairman RUSSELL. That, of course, is true.

Mr. ESTEY. My only point here is I think that if we could have it clear that teaching would be a way of fulfilling your obligated service, we could then attract many more people into teaching than now are attracted at all, and that this would help siphon off this great surplus in the manpower pool.

Chairman RUSSELL. I see what you are, of course, proposing. What you are proposing now is to let him know even before he reaches the age of registration that if he proposes to be a teacher, that after he registers and if he qualifies himself as a teacher and does teach, that is, his time in teaching will be credited for his military service.

Mr. ESTEY. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. We had witnesses here yesterday who proposed a similar plan for all of the students of the various sciences, anything from geology to electronics, that all of them should be permitted to say "I am going to enter one of these engineering professions or into a scientific calling", and he could discharge his military obligation by serving and working in his profession. I don't know how far we could carry that. It could probably get down so far that the pool of those who are actually going to be liable for military service would be rather small. If you are going to take 200,000 a year for teachers and these people are going to take about 50 or 60,000 a year for scientists, we might not have enough healthy ones left to carry a gun. We have not gotten down to pushbutton war yet. We still need men with strong backs as well as active minds in the military, in some phases of it.

Mr. ESTEY. I think that is unquestionably a good point, Senator Russell. If I can do some quick mathematics here, it seems to me that the Defense Department figures, showing that the liability is not so inequitable, as some of us think, says that by 1963 of men who will reach the age of 26, 8 out of 10 qualified will have served or currently be serving and 5.5 out of 10 of all men. That includes 4-F's and other deferments.

But you take the total manpower pool, which is about 1.2 million at that time.

Chairman RUSSELL. It is increasing.

Mr. ESTEY. Yes, sir; that is correct. But of the 26-year-olds at that time, in 1960, I think it is about 1.2 million.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ESTEY. And you take 2 out of 10 of those and that is about 240,000 men who they predict will not be serving any obligation, a great many of those are those who hit 26, having still been in graduate school the whole time and therefore are free. But you also take the some 40 percent of that group which would be 480,000 who are 4-F's, many of those I think have brains who could be used, and I would guess that perhaps there would actually be a surplus rather than a shortage of trained manpower that even when the services take their chunk out would still be left over.

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course, that would depend on a great many imponderables.

Mr. ESTEY. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. We don't know exactly what kind of a war we are likely to get into, if we do get into one. We pray we don't get into any kind of a hot war but we could get into a number of conventional peripheral wars that would require a tremendous amount of manpower because we would not want to be the first ones to use the all-out nuclear weapons.

Mr. ESTEY. I think what I am proposing could be done by executive action in which case it would be easy overnight to just say OK, no more of this kind of exemption.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't know whether that could be done by executive action or not. There may be authority.

I haven't studied the act though I should be more familiar with it from that angle. It is an interesting thought and I am sure that the committee will give due consideration to it.

Senator SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I just want to make one observation, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Estey, isn't the problem—as the Senator said we had in physics and engineering yesterday—the problem is this. You say there are 150,000 more teachers needed. There are only 50,000 going in and we need 200,000.

The problem is whether these young men who say they are going to be teachers will actually go into the teaching profession. That is the problem that we face here.

Mr. ESTEY. Yes, sir; but at least this would supply——

Senator SALTONSTALL. As the chairman points out, after they pass the age of induction, how long will they stay in the teaching profession? That is putting the problem in another way.

Mr. ESTEY. Well, I would say that we obligate them for 3 years, even up to age 35 say, as we can do now, or else they get snagged for military service. I mean legally right now we can obligate them to age 35. I suppose it would be possible for somebody to stay a student up until he is 35 and then say the heck with it all. We have some perennial students.

Chairman RUSSELL. You have them under the present system.

Mr. ESTEY. Yes, sir. What I am going to try to point out is that I see this leak of trained manpower. I see in our college students

this erosion of their sense of duty because they see a lot of different ways to get out of the draft, and when there are a lot of different ways and they see a lot of people doing it, they think "Maybe I can do this," and so this is the approach. And this I think is a function first of not enough places to utilize all the people in the pool, and second, that they don't feel that their brains and talent could be used in the service of their country.

The inverse of that problem is the very problem that the teacher shortage presents and it seems to me if you combine the two you might have a quite new way of some solution of the two problems at once.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARTLETT. You would not have the man go into uniform and then be assigned to teaching?

Mr. ESTEY. No, sir; I would just call teaching say for a period of 3 years as alternate service.

Senator BARTLETT. Who would be the judge of the particular person's capability?

Mr. ESTEY. I think this could work *laissez faire*. If he goes to a school or college and says "Here are my credentials and I would like to teach," the school could say we take you or not.

If he goes to a number of schools and finds there are no vacancies and he does not pass their qualifications, then he is drafted.

Senator BARTLETT. Here he will be performing his military service at a pay rate much above the boy in uniform. Isn't that fellow going to feel that he is being discriminated against?

Mr. ESTEY. That is a refreshing viewpoint, we hear so much about how the teachers are underpaid. You are quite right, in contrast the teacher might be overpaid.

Well, a lot of these boys I think would seek to get commissions in the military service anyway, and by that standard I think they would probably be underpaid if they went into teaching. Still, however, that is an excellent point, I think, that as teachers—well, of course, I just thought of a danger in this. With a surplus perhaps of applicants, maybe the teachers' salaries would not stay up as high as they have.

Senator BARTLETT. Now, you bring 150,000 more people into the teaching profession each year by your plan. What is the ratio now of men to women teachers, would you say?

Mr. ESTEY. I am sorry, sir, I don't know. I would have to guess about 50-50 on the basis of biological statistics.

Senator BARTLETT. We will need more women in the 200,000 total.

Mr. ESTEY. I have no idea how to get more women. Perhaps if you get more men into teaching you also can get more women in teaching.

Senator BARTLETT. You have made a fascinating suggestion that I think is worthy of exploration. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Estey.

Mr. ESTEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness I might say happens to be a fellow citizen of mine from the State of Georgia. I call Mr. Mike Hendrix, who is chairman of the Military Affairs Council of the American Veterans of World War II.

Have a seat, Mr. Hendrix.

STATEMENT OF COL. MIKE Y. HENDRIX, AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. HENDRIX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, you have made remarks about Massachusetts citizens. I say as a Massachusetts citizen I have found people who come from Georgia very fine and very able people including the Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, sir. I can certainly reciprocate with respect to Massachusetts.

Mr. HENDRIX. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Mike Hendrix of Georgia, as has already been stated by our able senior Senator. I appear before you today in my capacity as chairman of the Military Affairs Council of the American Veterans of World War II. As you probably know, the American Veterans of World War II are men who served in the Armed Forces in World War II and during the Korean war. We represent the veterans of the most recent conflicts in which this Nation has participated, and we welcome the opportunity to appear before the committee in support of H.R. 2260.

Our natural and fundamental interest—the reason for our being—is to do all that we may be able to do to build and maintain the security of the Nation.

As veterans, the members of this organization have come face to face with the realization of the need of a continued and diligent effort on the part of every American citizen to maintain a defense posture readily recognizable and respected by our potential enemies as well as our would-be allies.

This organization is vitally concerned over the world situation and strongly urges, in these days of impending peril, that the people's leaders provide for the protection of this great Nation by requiring a defense force sufficiently prepared to meet any situation.

We realize the impossibility of a fool-proof or impregnable defense structure. However, we feel that if sufficient emphasis or stress is placed upon the defense effort, this Nation will survive and continue to occupy its place of leadership among nations of the world.

Since the young men of this Nation comprise, in the main, our manpower for defense, it is the opinion of this organization that provisions should be made for continued opportunities for young men to train and prepare for the job of defending the Nation.

We believe that the young man is entitled to such opportunities in order that he may have a decent chance to survive as an individual in the event of an emergency. We believe that through such training of a sufficient number the possibility of this country becoming involved in world conflict will be proportionately reduced. We believe that it is far more economical to spend money today on preparation than to spend lives tomorrow.

The position of the AMVETS is based, also, on a belief that every individual owes service in the Nation's defense. Furthermore, we believe that the Government has a duty to exact that service in the amount and of the kind that circumstances dictate.

The Selective Service System puts these concepts into effect. It supplies the basic drive or stimulus by which the Nation can be assured of an adequate defense posture.

We recognize that a Selective Service System in being today forms a vital cornerstone in the defense structure of this Nation. It maintains our military strength today. It permits this Nation to quickly mobilize its power to meet any increase in international danger.

It is concrete evidence in this to the world of the determination of this Nation to remain strong. Anything less than its continued operation as it is today would serve only to encourage any possible enemy, frighten and alienate our friends, and add to the uncertainty of neutrals.

We believe without any qualification that the keystone of the Nation's entire defense structure is a plan and an organization in being to insure that our manpower, which is our ultimate strength, can be utilized to insure national survival.

The Selective Service System provides that plan and organization. Its extension for 4 years and for as long as the Nation must maintain anything like our present defense forces—for as long as we face the dangers like those present in the world today—is absolutely essential.

The AMVETS National Convention in St. Louis last summer expressed that viewpoint in a resolution on this matter of extension, a copy of which is attached to this statement.

Again, we recommend and urge the enactment of legislation which will provide for the extension of the induction authority until July 1, 1963.

We appreciate your kindness and consideration in allowing us this opportunity to appear before your committee, and request this statement with the attachment be inserted in the record of this hearing.

Chairman RUSSELL. The resolution to which Colonel Hendrix referred will be printed in the record following his statement.

(The document referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION No. 224

Whereas section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferment under section 6 of such act has ceased to exist; and

Whereas selective service is based on the accepted principle of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation; and

Whereas the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every young man to serve his country in a military capacity; and

Whereas the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefor under the aforesaid act is essential to insure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces since voluntary enlistments in such forces and their Reserve components are greatly stimulated and influenced by the mere existence of that induction authority; and

Whereas the existence of full induction authority enables the Selective Service System (1) to insure that the required strength of the active Armed Forces be maintained both directly by induction and indirectly by stimulating enlistments, (2) to assist in maintaining the required strength of the Reserve forces by deferring inductions of members who serve satisfactorily, and (3) by classifications deferring induction, to channel men possessing critical skills or the requisite ability to acquire them into essential activities and occupations including engineering, scientific and technical pursuits and teaching, and the study and preparation for such fields; and

Whereas the Selective Service System maintains through registration an inventory of all men of military age including the only inventory of veterans no longer in the Armed Forces who in an emergency might be needed quickly for augmentation of those forces, and keeps current the availability for order to

active duty in time of emergency of over a million members of the Standby Reserve; and

Whereas selective service has become an integral part of the Nation's defense and the Selective Service System, by its decentralized system of operation through over 4,000 local and appeal boards in every community made up of local citizens, has earned and enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people; and

Whereas the local boards of the Selective Service System in every community of this Nation would render invaluable service in the event of an all-out emergency because of their ability to furnish manpower at local levels to any agency authorized to requisition men for specific duties; and

Whereas some 40,000 of the 46,000 full- and part-time officers and employees of the Selective Service System have volunteered their services to the Government and receive no compensation; and

Whereas the annual cost of operating the Selective Service System is only about 16 cents per year for every man, woman, and child in this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That AMVETS go on record as urging the National Congress, the Department of Defense, and the President of these United States to further amend section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, so that all the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963, and that the AMVETS use all of its efforts and influence to this end.

Chairman RUSSELL. Are there any questions? We thank you very much for bringing the views of this great organization to the committee, and I am glad to have had you here speaking personally.

Mr. HENDRIX. Thank you very much, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Dr. Harold W. Glattly, representing the National Medical Veterans Society.

STATEMENT OF DR. HAROLD W. GLATTLY, NATIONAL MEDICAL VETERANS SOCIETY

Dr. GLATTLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Harold W. Glattly, a physician in Washington, D.C. In the absence of its president, Dr. Milton Davis, I am representing the National Medical Veterans Society at this hearing on H.R. 2260.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to have you, Dr. Glattly. I hope the fact that Dr. Davis is not here in person does not indicate he is indisposed?

Dr. GLATTLY. No, sir, he has a very complicated heart operation this morning and he is unable to be present.

Chairman RUSSELL. He has been before this committee before in matters relating to the Selective Service Act concerning physicians and dentists and has been very helpful to the committee in the past.

Dr. GLATTLY. Our society wishes me to express our sincere appreciation for the privilege of appearing before the committee.

We have had a continuing and primary interest in the procurement of medical officers and the utilization of medical manpower by the military services. We feel that the country is obligated to provide the Armed Forces with a sufficient number of physicians to insure a high standard of medical care to service people on active duty and to meet the immediate medical requirements of a military emergency. The society recognizes that this cannot be accomplished today on a purely voluntary basis and therefore recommends the retention in H.R. 2260 of those special provisions of the Selective Service Act which apply to physicians, dentists, and other medical specialists.

We would like to commend the committee and the Congress as well as the Armed Forces for the actions that have been taken to interest physicians in a service career.

These include:

1. The Medical and Dental Officers Incentive Act, Public Law 497, 84th Congress, which provides special pay for medical officers.

2. Appointing, reappointing, and promoting physicians to ranks commensurate with their professional education, experience, and ability. This includes bringing physicians on active duty in the grades of captain in the Army and Air Force or lieutenant, senior grade in the Navy.

3. Improved utilization of medical officers.

Actions of this character have had the effect of reducing materially the dependence of the military services upon involuntary procurement of physicians. The society especially wishes to emphasize the major role that the special-pay act has played in building up the strength of the regular Medical Corps of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In our opinion, every effort should be made to continue the provision which provides that a physician who is inducted as an enlisted man can be utilized in his professional capacity.

Care of civilian dependents: Our society supported the Dependents' Medical Care Act, in large measure because it was expected to reduce the number of physicians who would be drafted. We feel that the budgetary restrictions recently imposed upon the Office of Dependents Medical Care might well result in the drafting of physicians to care for dependents and that constant vigilance is indicated to insure that this does not happen.

Tour of duty: This next item was very forcibly presented a moment ago by General Harrison representing the National Guard Association.

The present law authorizes the President to order to active duty Reserve officers under the age of 35 for not more than 24 months. We believe that this stipulation of law is very important and should be retained. There is a mandatory Reserve period of 4 additional years for those enlisted, inducted, or appointed prior to their 26th birthday.

Information from the Defense Department would indicate that for this reason not only do very few physicians accept commissions prior to the age of 26 but also, since Defense has been calling as few as 50 percent of those eligible in each intern class, quite a number have not been applying for commissions at all.

The fair and orderly procurement of physicians to meet an emergency has always been a subject of deep interest to the National Medical Veterans Society.

Under the present law, which is now up for reenactment, it is entirely possible for a physician who has completed a 2-year tour of active duty to be recalled during his period of Reserve obligation before certain other draft-eligible physicians without prior service.

The society suggests that consideration might well be given to a change which would eliminate in the law the Reserve obligation for physicians following a 2-year tour of active duty.

This would remove the disparity which now exists with respect to the Reserve obligations for those who are commissioned before and those after reaching the age of 26.

Such action might very well result in lessening the reluctance of young physicians to apply for commissions and thereby aid in building up a pool with which to meet an emergency.

Justification for this relief lies in the fact that a far higher percentage of physicians with draft liability are needed to meet our national defense requirements than any other segment of American society.

In summary we recognize the fact that today the legitimate needs of the Armed Forces for physicians cannot be met on a voluntary basis. In the interest of reducing the dependence of the Department of Defense upon procurement of physicians by draft, we urge the continuance of incentive measures for career medical officers and request that consideration be given to correcting the present disparity of Reserve obligations between those physicians commissioned before and after the age of 26.

In closing, the society again expresses its appreciation for the privilege of presenting its views on this subject before the committee.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are very glad always to hear from the National Medical Veterans Society, Doctor. I, of course, have always done everything within my power to distribute as widely and as equitably as possible the responsibilities of service in the military forces. Do you think it would help if it was decided to eliminate the Reserve participation obligation completely following the 2-year tour of active duty and to insert a provision in the law that no doctor who had served for 2 years should be called back to active duty so long as there were other doctors who were eligible for service and who had not been called?

Dr. GLATTLY. That is the purpose of this, except for those physicians, Mr. Chairman, who elect of their own free will to be a member of the Reserve component.

Chairman RUSSELL. Oh, I understand. I said against his will.

Dr. GLATTLY. Yes, against his will.

Chairman RUSSELL. We never know what is going to happen in this world, and if an all-out nuclear war were to come, we would need every doctor we could get and need him mighty quick, and we would not want to spend a lot of time looking for him. If he had a number in the Reserve, and you could bring him right in, it seems to me that that would reach what you are advocating.

Dr. GLATTLY. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Saltonstall.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I have no questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARTLETT. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Doctor.

Dr. GLATTLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Mr. Bernard Weitzer, who represents the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

We are always glad to have you with us, Mr. Weitzer.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BERNARD WEITZER ON BEHALF OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE U.S.A.

Mr. WEITZER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege and honor which I greatly prize to appear before your committee once again on behalf of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America—this time to testify in favor of H.R. 2260, the essence of which is strongly supported in the resolution on selective service passed at the 63d annual national convention of our organization in Los Angeles, August 1958.

A copy of that resolution is attached to this written statement of my comments to your committee. And I ask that it be inserted in the record. The resolution states in considerable detail the reasons why our organization supports this bill.

Those reasons go beyond the process of inducting men into the armed services under the provision of the act which is to be extended by H.R. 2260. As many members of this committee know, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America have supported, for nearly 40 years, a universal military training program. Despite our efforts, we have not been able to see such a program achieved.

Failing such achievement, we have appeared before your committee, time and time again, in favor of selective service, the Reserve Forces Training Act and the recommendations of the Hook Committee report and the Cordiner Committee report which have been substantially approved by your committee and the Congress. The legislation which resulted has bolstered our national defense.

Such legislation has enabled us in peacetime and wartime, to bring sufficient manpower into our Armed Forces and Reserves. Further the Career Incentive Act of 1958 especially shows signs of helping to retain in service, the essential trained men whose experience in handling modern weapons of war is vital to our national security. For all of this good legislation our organization is grateful to you.

As we approach the expiration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1950 as amended, we believe it should be extended until July 1, 1963. Such an extension will signalize to the men in the Kremlin as well as to our allies, that in respect to manpower, we shall not be caught short of the facilities for strengthening our own forces whenever the need arises.

There is no assurance that pushbutton warfare will reduce the need for trained manpower. In fact, the complexity of improved weapons of war will demand more and better trained men to utilize such weapons effectively.

"More bang for a buck," is not the answer, either, for our potential enemy is getting that extra bang, too.

Our military strength is not the whole answer to deterring war, but it is of supreme importance to our national security and the security of the free world. That is one of the major reasons why H.R. 2260 should be approved. Over the years, the Universal Military Training and Service Act has demonstrated that through its operations, our Armed Forces can be maintained at the strength limits which the Congress authorized.

I would like to say here I very much regret that the Defense Department has not kept up to the limits which the Congress has authorized. That is one of the points on which General Harrison touched, which is a particular sore spot with our organization, and that is that the 6-month trainees under the Reserve Forces Training Act have been restricted in numbers, and that the Reserve forces, the National Guard and the Army Reserve, have not been permitted to build up to the numbers which we think are necessary.

The act has functioned as effectively as any piece of legislation I know of to apportion as evenly and as fairly as possible, the responsibility of military service to the youth of our country with a minimum of disturbance to their educational or business careers.

I would like to add here in view of some of the testimony that I heard this morning, there is just a little too much concern about the convenience and the ease and the comfort of mind that everybody is supposed to enjoy as a constitutional right. Under the world situation as it exists today, I don't know how anybody can enjoy much comfort of mind when you consider the possibilities that we face in every area of the whole world, and I think that this act, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, has been a good piece of legislation; it has been effectively administered, and I think with a minimum of inequity. If you want to look around for inequities look at the Income Tax Act which is supposed to cover everybody and then you will get an idea of how well this one is working out.

I respectfully urge you to extend the act as provided in the bill you are considering.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Weitzer, we are very glad to have that fine statement on behalf of this great patriotic organization, and the resolution to which you referred was adopted, as I understand it, unanimously, by the Jewish War Veterans at their last national convention at Los Angeles and it will appear in the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Whereas the existence of full induction authority under the Universal Military Training and Service Act enables the Selective Service System (1) to insure that the required strength of the Active Armed Forces be maintained both directly by inductions and indirectly by stimulating enlistments, (2) to assist in maintaining the required strength of the Reserve Forces by deferring inductions of members who serve satisfactorily, (3) by classifications deferring induction, to channel men possessing critical skills or the requisite ability to acquire them into essential activities and occupations, including engineering, scientific and technical pursuits, and teaching, and the study and preparation for such fields, (4) the Selective Service System, based on the accepted principle of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation, has fairly and effectively chosen the men to meet this universal obligation and privilege, and

Whereas the Selective Service System maintains through registration an inventory of all men of military age including the only inventory of veterans no longer in the Armed Forces who in an emergency might be needed quickly for augmentation of those forces, and keeps current the availability for order to active duty in time of emergency of over a million members of the Standby Reserve, and

Whereas selective service has become an integral part of the Nation's defense and the Selective Service System, by its decentralized system of operation through over 4,000 local and appeal boards in every community made up of local citizens, has earned and enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people, and

Whereas section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferments under section 6 of such act have ceased to exist, and

Whereas the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every young man to serve his country in a military capacity, and

Whereas the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefor under the aforesaid act is essential to insure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces since voluntary enlistments in such forces and their Reserve components are greatly stimulated and influenced by the mere existence of that induction authority, and

Whereas the local boards of the Selective Service System in every community of this Nation would render invaluable service in the event of an all-out emergency because of their ability to furnish manpower at local levels to any agency authorized to requisition men for specific duties, and

Whereas some 40,000 of the 46,000 full- and part-time officers and employees of the Selective Service System have volunteered their services to the Government and receive no compensation, and

Whereas the annual cost of operating the Selective Service System is only about 16 cents for every man, woman, and child in this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 63d Annual National Convention assembled in Los Angeles, Calif., August 3-10, 1958, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, be further amended so that all the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963: and be it further

Resolved, That we use every effort that this be made known to the Members of the Congress and to the President.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Weitzer.

The next witness is Mr. Herman Will, Jr., who represents the Methodist Church, the Methodist General Conference. Have a seat, Mr. Will.

STATEMENT OF HERMAN WILL, JR., BOARD OF WORLD PEACE, THE METHODIST CHURCH

Mr. WILL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Herman Will, Jr., of Chicago, Ill. I am an attorney and am presently the administrative secretary of the Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church.

I wish to present to you the position of the Methodist General Conference, the highest official body of our denomination which time and again has opposed any continuing program of universal military training. In 1956, meeting at Minneapolis, Minn., the general conference declared:

We reaffirm traditional Methodist opposition to any system of peacetime universal military training. We appeal to the United States to give bold leadership looking toward the universal abolition of peacetime conscription by or through the United Nations.

In addition, the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church in a recent statement urged—

a careful restudy before taking any measures to enact a universal draft law, which seems to be unnecessary as well as ineffective.

In the light of these statements we wish to urge upon you serious consideration of other alternatives than the 4-year renewal of the present Draft Act.

THE DRAFT AND YOUTH

I would like to speak to four concerns that we have. First is our concern for what compulsory military service does to young people in our society. It was interesting to note that in the debate in the House of Representatives on the extension of the draft, Representative Roman C. Pucinski, of the 11th District of Illinois, spoke to this very point.

I quote his comments in part :

I just completed, before I came to the Congress, a very intensive survey in Chicago on teenage gangs and juvenile delinquency, and I find that the draft has a very important effect on the present development of our young people. Every youngster in my city between the ages of 18 and 26 has to register for the draft. This means that hundreds of thousands of youngsters are forced to live in a shadow of constant doubt as to their future when actually only a few thousands are ultimately drafted.

This uncertainty that these young people are constantly faced with makes it virtually impossible for them to plan their future in an orderly manner. The most tragic aspect of this situation is that many young men who graduate from high school and who do not, or cannot because of economic reasons, go to college find it impossible to get decent employment because the first thing they are asked by a potential employer is what is his draft status? The moment a youngster admits that he is eligible for the draft he is either given the lowest type of employment or, as is the case in many instances, flatly denied employment. I could not begin to tell you the hardships that this situation is causing to thousands of youngsters who are not seeking a way to shirk responsibility but who, because of the cumbersome mechanics of the draft, are involuntarily plunged into this pool of teenage idleness.

But the adverse effects of the draft are not limited only to young people who are awaiting possible induction. The Secretary of the Navy in May 1958 in a statement quoted in U.S. News & World Report (May 30) made the following observation :

Over a long period the increasing disciplinary problems in the Naval Establishment, especially a.w.o.l. rates and the brig population, have been a matter of grave concern to me. The a.w.o.l. rate rose 30 percent in 1957 over 1956 and courts-martial continue at the rate of 1,000 a week.

Surely these words indicate that there must be much suppressed resentment on the part of those enlisted men who volunteer in order to avoid being drafted.

MILITARISM IN AMERICAN LIFE

A second concern is the steady growth and increasing permanence of militarism in American life. Let me assure you that this is not a concern merely of a few idealistic churchmen. The Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, testifying before a House subcommittee on January 20, 1957, stated :

I have said to a number of my friends that one of the serious things about this defense business is that so many Americans are getting a vested interest in it; properties, business, jobs, employment, votes, opportunities for promotion and advancement, bigger salaries for scientists, and all that, it is a troublesome business.

The growth in the size and influence of the Military Establishment in American life has resulted in an enormous impact of military training, thinking, and indoctrination on large numbers of people. It was with this in mind that Halford Hoskins wrote in the annals of

the American Academy of Political and Social Science in 1945 the following:

The results of 1 year's training will not greatly affect the body politic and even after 5 or 10 years no striking change in public outlook may be apparent. Nevertheless, in the course of a generation the effects will have become cumulative even if they have grown imperceptible, * * * and military considerations may be expected to enter more and more into party politics, governmental policy, and economic and social life.

Who can deny the truth of this statement, especially as during these very weeks our Nation is considering all too casually the extension of a conscription act which in one form or another has already been on the statute books for 19 years. This is happening in the United States of America, which for decades was proud of the fact that it had resisted successfully the system of military conscription with which the peoples of many European nations had been burdened for a long time.

CONSCRIPTION AND FREEDOM

A third consideration is that of human freedom. We are living in a period of history when Government seems to grow ever larger and more powerful while the individual is subordinated more and more to the Nation and to the State. The compulsion of the individual person by the requirement of military service, once unpopular and detested by Americans generally, has come to be accepted increasingly as not only necessary but even legitimate.

Some argue that the extension of a military obligation to all persons brings about a desirable situation of equality, such a situation also results in the equal compulsion of all in this effort to secure equality of obligation and is conducive neither to justice nor to freedom. Furthermore, to extend conscription as an easy solution to a difficult problem, avoids serious consideration of the basic freedom of individual persons in a democratic society.

All of this may be dismissed easily as mere idealism or philosophy, but when all is said and done it is the preservation of this idealism and this philosophy that lies behind our opposition to totalitarianism.

Writing in the American Journal of Sociology in March 1946, August B. Hollingshead in a study entitled "Adjustment to Military Life" stated:

The perfectly trained soldier is one who has had his civilian initiative reduced to zero. In the process the self becomes identified with the institution and dependent upon it for direction and stimulation. The ideally adjusted soldier would be a military dependent who looked to the institution for all his personal, social, and emotional satisfaction. * * * In short, the military situation is designed to produce soldiers—men conditioned to institutional requirements, defined situations, and explicit expectancies who will neither think for themselves nor make demands on the institution for needs that are not identified with institutional ends * * *.

MILITARY POLICIES AND PROGRESS TOWARD PEACE

A final consideration is the preoccupation with military strength which grips our Nation. This emphasis upon military policies places us frequently at a serious disadvantage at a number of points.

Professor Hans Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, writing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists in November 1954 made the following statement :

The counterrevolutionary appearances of our military-oriented policies disarm us not only in the struggle for the minds of men but in the military struggle as well. For it can be asserted axiomatically that once the problem of revolution can be stated only in military terms it has become insoluble and even a unlikely military success would only obscure the political defeat.

More hope for security lies in the vigorous prosecution of other policies than primarily military ones. Policies which stir the enthusiasm, lift the morale, and gain the support of great numbers of men around the world are far more likely to lead to a greater degree of security for the United States of America than those which are based primarily upon the restraining effect of military power.

Progress in our efforts to achieve disarmament of the nations is of tremendous importance. Ought we not to consider the effect that a move away from a system of military conscription to a voluntary enlistment program would have upon the thinking not only of the world at large but the Soviet leaders in particular. Of course, there are those who will say immediately that it will be interpreted as a sign of weakness and accordingly exploited by the Communist leadership.

No doubt there are Soviet leaders who are saying the same thing to any who may possibly be proposing in the top circles of Communist leadership any moves which would appear to be conciliatory or involve a possible reduction in military power.

Yet, certainly we would be greatly heartened could we discern such policies developing on the part of the Soviet Union. One of our great difficulties today is our lack of imagination and our inability to put ourselves in the other fellow's shoes.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS—A PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE

In closing, let me point out that although as a Nation we have sought to increase the attractiveness of reenlistment for those men already in the Armed Forces, we have done nothing comparable to attract young men to volunteer initially—apart from any threat of being drafted. There are many things we could do to make voluntary enlistments for relatively long periods more attractive.

The New York Times of February 26, 1959, reported that the British Defense Minister, Mr. Duncan Sandys, said that—

recruitment for the Regular Army was going so well that conscription would end next year (in 1960), as planned. Youth born in the last 3 months of 1939 will not have to register, he said.

In a bulletin from the British Information Service it is pointed out that—

the new recruits are on a longer engagement (5 or 6 years) than the National Service men they replace.

At this very point it is relevant to consider the statement of Representative Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, who during the debate in the House declared :

As some of you may know, I have recently retired from the Army after 33 years of active service. In the light of my experience, I have no hesitation in

telling you that there are thousands of American soldiers performing duties completely unrelated to our security effort and contributing nothing to our capability to defend this Nation.

May we urge upon the members of this committee as well as upon the entire Senate the desirability of scrutinizing the proposed extension of the draft most critically.

Surely, every effort ought to be made to find some other alternative to this program of military conscription which is becoming a more permanent part of American life every time that it is extended.

The important values involved merit greater efforts to discover a more desirable alternative than the present Universal Military Training and Service Act.

I will try to answer any questions that you may have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Your statement speaks for itself I think, Mr. Will, and we are glad to have you here.

Mr. WILL. Thank you very much.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Mr. Stewart Meacham, of the American Friends Service Committee, Inc.

Mr. Meacham.

STATEMENT OF STEWART MEACHAM ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. MEACHAM. Senator Russell, we are very glad to be here. I think you have a copy of our statement which we hope will be entered into the record.

My name is Stewart Meacham. I represent the American Friends Service Committee, a Quaker organization which is vitally interested in the question of continuing forced induction into the armed services.

My personal background has included a period of Government service, both in the United States and overseas, several years in India as a missionary of the Methodist Church, and several years on the staff of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

At present I am director of the labor-international affairs program of the American Friends Service Committee.

We believe that the American Friends Service Committee is qualified to testify concerning conscription because of our experience as an administrator of civilian public service during World War II, our active work in many parts of the world alleviating human needs and because of our contacts with many of the young people in colleges across the country.

As a religious organization, we feel bound to do all we can to encourage peaceful solutions where conflict threatens.

We are happy to share our concern about conscription with this committee and also we are grateful for this opportunity.

The American Friends Service Committee is opposed to any extension of the power to induct. We have always opposed war and preparation for war, especially when it crowds out preparation for peace.

We believe that war itself is contrary to the will and the nature of God. We believe that it is wrong for men to participate in war.

We believe that conscription is an instrument of war. By it young men are forced into training for war. We deny that the State has the right to force men to undertake wrong actions. Our motivation is

basically religious. We are convinced that conscription degrades the spiritual quality of the life of our people.

Our country has led the world in providing good government to man, and achieving the greatest measure of freedom and liberty ever known.

It is for this reason that refugees have come to America; it is for this reason that young democracies have used our Constitution as a basis for their own; it is for this reason that we cannot be true to ourselves unless we oppose totalitarian oppression and reject the techniques of totalitarianism.

A peacetime conscription measure is not an outgrowth of democracy and freedom. It is something we have borrowed from abroad.

The American ideal is based on new answers to old problems. European governments from the time of Caesar, have frequently been ruled, directly or indirectly, by military leaders.

In America, we have always insisted that the military must remain subordinate to the civilian. Our first great General, George Washington himself, said—

avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty.

Clearly, we have not heeded this advice. Our Military Establishment is the largest spender in the history of the world. Military men affect policy in every branch of the Government.

The thick walls of official secrecy keep the public and even the Congress from knowing what goes on.

Vast and unnamed sums are spent to influence public opinion in favor of the military. The easy access to funds which cost-plus provisions in armaments contracts provides permits Government subsidy of the promotional campaigns of the missiles and weapons merchants.

Their profits mount as their costs mount under contracts which we allocated by private negotiations rather than competitive bidding. The result is a nation which is being led by easy stages to accept a military frame of mind, conditioned to expect military solutions even for problems which can never be solved by military means.

We see this with clarity in the case of peacetime conscription. Less than 150 years ago Daniel Webster spoke in the House of Representatives in tones of shocked horror at the idea of even wartime conscription.

By gradual stages we have come close to the point now where peacetime conscription is not even discussed. It is taken for granted.

This change has been accompanied by a gradual deterioration of our zeal to protect the citizen from the excessive demands of the state.

In other words when America turns to peacetime conscription as an established aspect of her life, America has surrendered to the very ascendancy of military authority over the citizen which provoked the revolution that gave America her birth.

Our revolution against tyranny took place so long ago that it is not surprising that we may have become careless and allowed some of our liberties to atrophy from neglect or from a mistaken fear that they weaken us rather than give us strength.

But other lands are looking to us, lands that are only now emerging from colonial control. What do the billion people of southern

Asia and Africa feel when they see mighty America, the last hope of freedom on earth, timidly coercing a handful of her young men each year to enter military service?

This is not an example to them of confident living.

It is a sign that we are afraid—not of Russia, but of ourselves and of our own devotion to the principles we profess. The peacetime draft puts us in a false light before the world.

It causes men who need to believe in democracy to turn away disillusioned. If we who have tried government rooted in freedom accept coercion, how can those who have not tried it, believe in it?

Some say we have no alternative. This cannot be true. The alternative to conscription is constructive service for peace.

Young people who have no faith in the efficiency of enforced conscription would volunteer in large numbers to help people learn to help themselves.

A real army of American youth feeding hungry refugees, digging wells for thirsty villages, piercing iron curtains of mistrust, and making real friends in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—this is the true spirit of America.

Furthermore, it is the essence of peace.

Young men could be given the opportunity of volunteering for international projects of good will. We organize work camps of young people each year to do practical work in different parts of the world and we know how readily our young people respond.

The resulting reservoir of good will toward America which would result would rapidly ease the tensions which produce wars.

This plan offers a practical, workable, realistic way out of the stalemate and a genuine hope for peace. The only real security is not more armies but an end to war. War will never end so long as we give it first place on our national agenda. The need is to build the peace. These are times which require great courage—wisdom and foresight are not enough.

Just ending the draft is meaningless. But ending the draft so that valuable manpower may be freed to constitute an investment in peace, this is a meaningful goal. It is a daring goal. But it is a realistic goal. We urge you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, first of all, to see the draft in terms of its effect on the mind and soul of America.

We have had a good deal of experience with working camps in different parts of the country where we know feelings as to America's contributions has been built up and we have much more confidence in that than in handing a gun to a young man who is forced to take it and keeping him in that kind of situation for a given period of time.

We urge you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee first of all to see the draft in terms of its effect on the mind and soul of America.

Chairman RUSSELL. If I understand you correctly, Mr. Meacham, you not only suggest that we don't extend the Selective Service Act, but you are just opposed to any armaments, basically opposed to any military system.

Mr. MEACHAM. Yes; we are, and we believe that there are alternatives.

Chairman RUSSELL. I respect that, but I think all these glorious liberties that you are talking about would perish very quickly if we were to follow that. I respect your viewpoint.

Mr. MEACHAM. I recognize that viewpoint, and of course it is prevailing and we know that the logic of a course is determined mainly by the assumptions on which it is based, and our assumptions are just entirely different. That we recognize, but we do believe, sir, that—

Chairman RUSSELL. I am afraid this army of young Americans you are talking about would not even be permitted to pierce the Iron Curtain to help feed these people and drill their wells and all. They would probably be gobbled up if they did not have any military force back of them.

Mr. MEACHAM. You know, we would like to try.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am a little afraid to take that daring step. It is rather daring all right. I will say this much for the Friends, though. When they do make up their minds it is not wrong to fight they make terrific soldiers. We saw that when we saw Nathan Yelgren, Smead Butler, and others, when they finally decided to fight they were very good. We are mighty glad to get your views.

Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARTLETT. No, Mr. Chairman, I have so many questions to ask that I had better ask none. It would take too much time.

Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to have you, Mr. Meacham. The next witness is Mr. Lester Forest who represents the American Humanist Association.

STATEMENT OF LESTER FOREST ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION

Mr. FOREST. Mr. Chairman, I would like to apologize for the informal manner that I have reproduced copies for distribution.

This was obtained on very short notice.

Chairman RUSSELL. It doesn't completely conform to the rules, but you may proceed. We will hear you anyhow, Mr. Forest.

Mr. FOREST. Thank you, sir.

My name is Lester Forest. I am a practicing attorney in New York City and I appear on behalf of the American Humanist Association. This is a national organization of individuals who are deeply interested in moral and ethical values. Its purpose is to promote such values without reference to any strictly religious or supernatural dogma. It holds very strongly for complete freedom of worship and the fullest practice of moral and ethical values.

I am here to present a very fine distinguished legal point to amend section 6(j) of the present act so as to extend conscientious objector status to nontheistic registrants.

On January 30, 1959, Mr. Paul Blanshard, on behalf of the American Humanist Association presented a statement to the House Armed Services Committee concerning the application of exemption to non-religious conscientious objectors.

My statement today supplements what was said then.

As an attorney I have been delegated the task of researching the law and it is my purpose now to bring to you the sum of that effort.

In a government "of the people" the individual is the prime concern. Our Bills of Rights and the entire spirit of democracy is premised on protecting the individual.

Each conscientious objector decision in the courts reflects analysis and review of individual situations and a review of the military service acts reveals a transition to the individuals' consideration.

For our purposes it will suffice to go back only to 1917 where exemption from military service was extended to persons who belonged to a group which forbade participation in war, and whose own religious convictions accorded with those of the group.

If the person belonged—he was well on the way to exemption.

But in 1940 the Service Act sought the individual's personal conviction as the springboard for exemption but required conviction to be founded in "religious training and belief."

In 1948, the law added a definition of religious training and belief to mean belief in a Supreme Being and specifically excluded any personal moral code or philosophical views. Thus, although we have a progression in the direction of considering the individual the 1948 act with its definition drew a line between individuals in the area of religion.

Perforce the definition those who could not state they believed in such a supernaturality (although they may be as religious in their convictions as those who believed) are denied a conscientious objector classification. This it is respectfully submitted is discrimination.

There is no law in his country that has stood the test of constitutionality that discriminates against an atheist or agnostic. To the contrary, one of the cornerstones of democracy is the principle of equality before the law, and the U.S. Supreme Court on innumerable occasions has extended the guarantees of free worship to include the right not to, thereby elevating the status of the nonbeliever, or agnostic, to one of parity with the conventional believer.

Admittedly the Congress has near unlimited war power and thereby can grant privilege or exemption as it sees fit. But in the spirit of our type of government once privilege or exemption have been extended it should be available to all equally.

Assuming two young men appear before the draft board, both seeking conscientious objector classification; one the son of a minister, the other the son of the head of a philosophy department in a university. The former gives religious reasons; the latter gives philosophic and moral reasons. All things being equal, under the present act the son of the minister might be granted the exemption; the son of the philosopher has no chance whatever.

Prior to the 1948 act the courts on two different occasions granted exemption on grounds other than conventional religious training and belief; one on an opposition to war based on humanitarian considerations and not on any obligation to a deity or supernatural power (*U.S. v. Badt*, 141 F. 2d 845); the other on the registrant's "conscience * * * that is for many persons of the present the equivalent of what has always been thought a religious impulse" (*U.S. v. Downer*, 135 F. 2d 521). And one case in December 1957 under the definition of "Supreme Being" a court granted exemption to a registrant whose "concept of a Supreme Being is love" (*U.S. v. Horst*, Mich. DC).

Thus we have three illustrations of courts straining to grant exemption by stretching terminology. But how about the 2,000 conscientious objectors who were not so fortunate, who were sent to prison for other than religious objections whose sincerity and conviction might have been just as true, just as great as the religious objectors but who did not have the equal chance to obtain exemption.

I might add at this point that the Unitarian Church does not require acceptance of a Supreme Being, and neither do the Universalists.

It is respectfully submitted that in this country the millions of people who believe in spiritual values, feel they have moral and ethical obligations without associating their beliefs with a formal theology or supernaturalism, deserve an equal standing before the law with those who believe in a Supreme Being.

Every registrant seeking conscientious objector classification must pass the acid test of sincerity. Therefore, the only question left is whether the registrant believes in a Supreme Being. It is repugnant to me to think that a person who cannot say he believes in a Supreme Being should be thought to have less moral, ethical, or spiritual obligations or fiber than the believer.

This is the only conclusion that follows from the discrimination against the person who cannot say he believes in a Supreme Being and whose sincerity is unquestioned.

Sincerity is the major test and before the definition came into the 1948 act each case was judged on the individual's personal conviction so long as it portended moral, spiritual, or ethical obligations.

A return to the language of the 1940 act with the additional words extending exemption to those whose personal moral and philosophical conviction conscientiously oppose their participation in war in any form, will serve to put all individuals equally before the law.

This position has been endorsed by the Unitarians and Friends in concept and principle.

Chairman RUSSELL. I did not understand the last statement.

Mr. FOREST. This position that has been taken by the American Humanist Association has been endorsed by the Unitarians and the American Friends both in concept and in principle.

Chairman RUSSELL. You mentioned the Universalist Church. Have they taken any position on it?

Mr. FOREST. Yes; their position is similar to ours, and they have not come out with a formal statement in that direction.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have to consider all exemptions of all kinds, sometimes on rather practical grounds. I notice you refer to the millions of people in this country who believe in spiritual values who feel they have moral and ethical obligations without associating their beliefs with formal theology or supernaturalism.

Have you any estimate of how many people might be involved that would register for the draft if we were to make these changes in the law?

Mr. FOREST. No; I don't have specific figures on that. However, in a negative way we might look at some of the polls that have been taken as to those who are affiliated with the church and those who

are not, and I believe the percentage is somewhere in the neighborhood of about 40 percent who are not associated with any church in any way whatsoever, 40 percent of the American population.

For what that may mean I throw it out to you. Perhaps on some future occasion I might actually research that particular point, but it might not be fruitful in the sense that if they don't commit themselves to any particular church, they still don't answer the question as to whether they believe in a non-Supreme Being or what have you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course, there would be a great many who did not believe in a Supreme Being, I suppose, who would have no conscientious scruples about military service.

Mr. FOREST. That is a query, sir, and I respect it. It is obvious from the statistics that I did present; namely, that there were 2,000 conscientious objectors in prison—

Chairman RUSSELL. That is what I drew on. No; there are only 2,000 there who were sent to prison.

Mr. FOREST. Those figures were accumulated between 1940 and 1948. There has been a population increase since 1948, which would bring us into some sizable figures.

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course, 1950-58 was the greatest period of the operation of the draft. That is when we brought 14 million people into the armed services during the war. Almost everybody that could walk and had one good eye went into the military service. If there were 2,000 conscientious objectors sent to prison under those conditions, I would assume that the number would be somewhat less under current conditions.

Mr. FOREST. But, Mr. Chairman, I don't think you mean to infer that the 2,000 should be overlooked or forgotten.

Chairman RUSSELL. Oh, indeed, no; if there is not but one. But I said and I predicated my whole question on the statement that we must consider the suggestion in relation to the effect it might have on the workings of the draft. That is the reason I asked the question. I would concede the right of one man in this country to have any faith that he saw fit, but I was also interested in knowing whether, if we made these changes, you had any information on whether it would likely effect 10,000 or 1 million young men from the military service. This committee has a responsibility under this, you understand, to try to see that we have some kind of defense in this country.

Mr. FOREST. I appreciate what you are asking, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. And to do it as fairly as we can and with as much consideration as possible to those who differ with our views.

Mr. FOREST. As a practical matter, I think it would be most difficult to ferret out statistics as to applicants or registrants who would be available to the draft within the next year or two, let us say, as to what numbers would be presented.

Chairman RUSSELL. I didn't ask you for statistics. I asked you if you had any estimate.

Mr. FOREST. No.

Chairman RUSSELL. But we won't get into that if you don't wish to make any suggestions in that area.

Are there any questions of Mr. Forest?

Senator BARTLETT. No, I have no questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. All right.

Mr. FOREST. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Forest, thank you. The next witness is Mrs. Wallace Streeter who will present the views of the Methodist Church Board of Missions.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WALLACE STREETER, THE METHODIST CHURCH BOARD OF MISSIONS

Mrs. STREETER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Mrs. Wallace Streeter, a resident of Washington, D.C. I represent the woman's division of Christian service of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, which is the duly elected administrative and policymaking body for nearly 2 million Methodist women across the Nation.

The woman's division has opposed the draft act from its beginning in 1940, and has consistently continued to express opposition to Universal Military Training and peacetime conscription in any form. We believe that such a continued draft policy is contrary to our democratic heritage and that it will undermine the way of life which this Nation seeks to uphold.

The woman's division opposes the extension of authority to induct under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. This opposition is based upon three main considerations:

1. We believe that the whole premise of this means of defense has ceased to have validity. The world has moved forward with an increasing tempo since the days when a large army of men with comparatively little training for their jobs was a significant deterrent to enemies bent on war. The nuclear space age calls for new means of defense in keeping with these times. We have read with interest many suggestions that have been made by those competent to be specific in this field and we believe that a highly trained and much smaller professional army secured by enlistment and paid adequately could replace the draft with much greater efficiency as far as actual warfare goes.

We also feel that if the noncombatant tasks of the Army were done by civilians who were paid at wage levels comparable to those of other men doing similar tasks under civilian control, the needs of the military would be cut down to the place where they could easily be met by enlistment.

It is of importance to note that Great Britain is to discontinue the draft next year because it finds that increased pay and special increments have attracted enough volunteers to fill the needs.

2. We feel great concern for the effect of continued selective service upon our Nation. For nearly 20 years young people have lived with fear and uncertainty during the formative years of their lives. The threat of the draft has hung over their high school and college careers and has worried and distracted them to the detriment of their education. The question of whether it was best to get the military service over or to wait and get as much education as possible before being called has been a disturbing factor in college life.

Decisions about marriage and jobs have been complicated by the uncertainties of fluctuating draft requirements.

This element of insecurity introduced into the lives of the young people has been hazardous for some and good for none. Education, vocation and human relationships have suffered.

As we analyze the disturbing apathy and desire to conform that educators are reporting from our college campuses, we believe that the selective service has contributed to this state of mind.

Faced by what seems to be a self-perpetuating universal military service, complicated by inevitable inequalities and uncertainties, a hopelessness and cynicism have descended on this generation of young people. They have tended to find security in self-centered conformity.

It is interesting to note in this connection that this is exactly the experience that educators have reported from European countries with universal military conscription. The development of such a climate in our country augurs no good for the Nation.

In addition to byproducts of this uncertainty in the lives of our young people, we must also evaluate the effect of actual military training on them. Military thinking with its grim necessity of playing down humanitarian values in favor of the military values will probably need to be with us as long as we continue to accept war as a probability.

However, to extend this type of influence over the entire fabric of life in this Nation is not necessary. It has been said that a nation that has universal military training for a sufficient length of time finds that it has entered into its thinking so deeply that it is difficult to even consider its abandonment.

This danger we face now in our opinion and it is extremely important that we analyze the situation for that before it is too late. Already millions of our young men have been exposed to the discipline which by its very nature must put war first and peacetime values second. Already we are too used to the situation to be much disturbed by it.

The time to draw this method of securing an army to a close and to begin to explore better methods of meeting national defense requirements is now. The very fact that inadequate hearings and hasty action in some quarters has begun to be a part of proceedings on this legislation is ominous.

This country was settled by many who fled universal military service abroad out of conscientious opposition to the principle involved.

Such training is in opposition to the historic policy of our Nation.

To abdicate this principle now is to abandon something that has been deeply cherished and important in our national character.

3. We believe that the adoption of this act would handicap our Nation as we pursue the vital task of finding a road toward worldwide enforceable disarmament. The very fact that we are not willing to think about alternatives to universal conscription is damaging to the national image in the eyes of others.

It suggests to the rest of the world that we are not as serious and hopeful as we might be about the creative demanding business of finding the roads toward permanent world peace.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions?

Senator BARTLETT. No, thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Mrs. Streeter. The next witness will be Mr. Richard Celeste, representing the National Conference of Methodist Youth.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD CELESTE, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF METHODIST YOUTH

Mr. CELESTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Richard Celeste. My home is in Lakewood, Ohio, and I am presently a student at Yale University. I am here on behalf of the National Conference of Methodist Youth which is the organization representing the million and a half high school youth and college students of the Methodist Church. While I do not presume to speak the voice of every youth and student of the Methodist Church, I do speak the sentiments of their democratic structure which has consistently opposed the concept of universal military training and peacetime conscription since 1945 through pronouncements by its legislative body and editorial comment in its official publication concern.

It bears this concern because of its understanding of the Christian Gospel which proclaims laws of this nature to be diametrically opposed to the thrust of a gospel proclaiming love and redemption as the way for men.

Obviously I do not speak from an academic point of view. I am 21 years old. I am a senior in college majoring in the field of African studies and expecting to graduate in June. I am physically fit and classified 2S. The problems posed by the draft are real ones to me as they are for thousands of persons like me in my organization. I speak out of involvement as well as interest.

There are obvious practical reasons for not extending the provisions in H.R. 2260 which would allow for the continuation of the induction of persons under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Peacetime conscription cannot accomplish the ends for which it was designed: An adequately trained manpower for an adequate posture of national security. The tremendous advances made in modern war technology would seem to require for that for more training than is possible in a brief 2-year period of military service even when it is followed by reserve training.

The rapid development of new and advanced weapons makes quickly obsolete the knowledge of men that have been out of service for a period of time.

The best indifferent and at worst belligerent attitude of most of the men drafted under the present law greatly undermines the possibilities of effective training especially in the short time that is available.

Peacetime conscription is inefficient: It is too expensive for the end which it desires to accomplish. It is particularly important to recognize this in the face of our imperative need for governmental accounting and economizing. Our efforts and resources are channeled into the training of men who in 97 cases out of 100 will leave the Armed Forces as soon as their 2-year term is up.

Draftees could scarcely contribute substantially to the highly trained and specialized Armed Forces which today's world demands. One quarter of our military efforts is spent on men who are often bitter about being in and only looking forward to getting out.

The amount of equipment damage caused each year by the inexperienced trainee is enough in itself to raise serious questions about the efficiency of this plan.

Peacetime conscription is detrimental to our educational needs. Although not immediately relevant, compulsory ROTC at land-grant institutions epitomizes the UMT ideal.

One example of the effect of this is a friend of mine who was ineligible for Phi Beta Kappa because his shoes weren't shined. This is an admittedly extreme example, but even where ROTC is not the main concern, the spectre of the inevitable draft creates a strong academic distraction.

It engenders a climate of uncertainty about plans for the future; interrupts study and work in areas considered nonessential; ties up crucial years in the lives of a segment of the population upon whom the security of our country is dependent in much more than simply a military sense; and, all in all, is a burdensome interruption which is accepted grudgingly if it can't, in some way, be avoided.

Over and above these practical considerations stand these ideological concerns:

Peacetime conscription is in fact discriminatory rather than universal. Over half of the men who are draft age are not seeing and will not see military service. The present draft law picks out the person who is healthy (by a standard which often excludes the all-American football player who has a bad knee); the person who is not intelligent enough to pursue a college and/or professional education (or more likely can't afford it); and the person who is (for one reason or another) childless.

I might bring up a point here, my roommate who is presently engaged has told me he feels that this is discriminatory to the person who is trying to look forward to a planned parenthood. The low income group of our Nation is greatly favored by the present draft while the upper income group is considerably less affected. This is contrary to the law itself and the principles of our Nation.

Peacetime conscription is an escape from responsibility on the part of Congress and the Armed Forces. Prof. John Galbraith, Harvard economist, has stated that the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. Thus, when the salary of a general or admiral was increased \$424 a month over previous pay (provided for by legislation in 1958) the earnings of a private, first class—originally less than \$100 per month—were increased by \$3 during the first 2 years.

One cannot help but be reminded of totalitarian regimes which use coercive powers to gain their ends instead of operating within a free market economy and with regard to the freedom of the individual to make the best and most profitable use of his time and talents.

The exercise of such coercive powers seems to have obscured both the democratic presuppositions and the economic principles of our Nation.

Peacetime conscription is fundamentally opposed to the value structure of the American way of life. We hold dear the concept that man was created for freedom and that in a democracy all men have the freedom to develop their talents and pursue uninterrupted goals that are meaningful to themselves and their society.

While citizenship obviously makes demands and freedom is never separated from responsibilities, to subject a citizenry to the regimentation of an ineffective law is to seriously compromise the beliefs of a democracy and the ideas of this Nation.

Equally important, it is damaging to the individual conscript, and therefore to society as a whole. The present law exposes an unnecessary number of minds to the necessary mind of the military which magnifies the role of the military institution out of all proportion. For an individual to choose the military as a career and a life is one thing; for an individual to be forced to its discipline is quite another.

The resentment of youth about to be drafted, followed by the tediousness of useless work which so many experience, and the loss of personal freedom, leave their mark.

Finally, and of supreme importance, the extension of peacetime conscription does nothing to suggest to the total world that we are seriously about the business of seeking new avenues for peace.

It fails to acknowledge that the great issues of our day are political, social, and economic. And the tragedy of the failure at both points lies in poor public relations for a measure providing scant aid for national security. We lose both at the point of world opinion and national defense.

We are aware that it is insufficient, as well as irresponsible, to protest without some suggestion for alternatives.

We do not pretend to suggest that there are easy routes to alternatives. It does seem to us that there are directions in which answers can be found.

There is much evidence to support the position that a volunteer Armed Force of sufficient strength could be achieved.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower has stated:

Enlistments are an important source of quality manpower. They have a further benefit of being in most instances for 3, 4, or more years, rather than 2 years. These longer-term enlistments have substantial advantages in reduced turnover, reduced training loads, and increased effective use of manpower.

As stated in the Cordiner report:

The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities.

The report emphasized both the feasibility and desirability of such a plan and contemplated savings from it at \$5.5 billion in 1960 and about \$6.5 billion in 1962.

It has been estimated that 80 percent of the work done by men in the Armed Forces does not and never will directly involve actual combat. Yet this work is carried on by men who meet the full physical qualifications for active duty. To complement the voluntary and more efficient fighting force it would be conceivable and most reasonable to hire civilians to fill these noncombat but essential posts. For the price of training an Army recruit (\$14,000 for 2 years according to a figure released by the Department of the Army) qualified civilians could certainly be hired.

In these directions lie great advantages. By removing the threat of interrupted educational, professional, and family-community life, a climate of sufficient security will be created to foster the depth approach we now need to educational and social achievement.

By discontinuing the peacetime conscription act, we will have proclaimed to the world in another way our serious intention of working for peace.

We will have effected substantial savings in finance, to undergird other programs of a nonmilitary nature and in manpower to provide additional personnel for service in attacking the basic social, economic, and political problems at this time.

In closing let me say that I am aware that the responsibility which lies in your hands is enormous. Your task as a Senate committee is to exercise the careful deliberation on this issue that the Constitution envisioned on all issues.

Because of this we know that you will not approve without careful examination H.R. 2260. We are particularly sure of this when the method which this resolution embodies strikingly resembles that which effected the Russian communes in the last decade.

Speaking at a graduate economics seminar in California recently First Deputy Mikoyan admitted that this venture failed because the incentive system was lacking. Do we have to learn a lesson from Mr. Mikoyan?

H.R. 2260 would extend quantity in the place of quality; it would extend expediency in the place of efficiency, and above all, it would extend compulsion in the place of volition.

I submit that it is your responsibility to reject this concept of our national security which relies so exclusively on military power.

Unfortunately our quest for national security through peacetime conscription has obscured a real understanding of what our national security involves. In a manner not unlike the Russian attempt at communes, we deny those values which we seek to preserve and have nothing to show for it but the inadequacy of the very method to which we have sacrificed our values.

At this point I would like to extend my remarks in two ways: First, by raising several questions of real importance which I feel did not get raised in the House hearings. Unfortunately the hearings were in the hands of the men who had to vote on it on the floor at that time.

The first question I would like to point out is this: We are all aware of the fact that the training of the inductee is a very costly and time-consuming process.

One question which was not put to General Taylor by the House committee is: What is the relative performance of the inductee as compared to the volunteer? What are the major kinds of jobs for which the inductee can qualify?

Another question: Statistics reveal that about a quarter of all volunteers for active service reenlist.

Why do not more reenlist? What incentives would be necessary to retain a higher percentage of experienced men?

This question was not put to the military men in their testimony.

Another question: Representative Thomas Curtis has pointed out to you that Seebies were able to use civilian skills in an efficient and economical fashion. Why can't civilians perform clerical construction, supply and services in the Army and in other branches of service?

General Hershey has said that one reason we must maintain the draft is so that we will have up-to-date Selective Service records in case of emergency. Is induction really necessary to maintain the Office of Selective Service records?

I would recall historically the period in 1947 and 1958 also when the office was maintained while induction was not being carried on.

Can there not be registration without induction?

And the final question: Again Representative Curtis pointed out yesterday that the House committee did not hear one educator testify. Is it not essential to have some idea of the impact of the draft on the process of education?

In conclusion, I would like to make clear my personal position on the practical decision which you men must face. I think many of my fellow Methodist youth would share this sentiment. I am opposed to the peacetime draft both in principle and for very practical reasons.

If it is a question of a 4-year extension or none at all, I would therefore stand by the latter. However, I realize that such an action would almost certainly not receive a favorable vote on the Senate floor.

Thus, I would appeal for an intense study of the sort recommended by Representative Curtis.

Since such a study would take a great deal of time and diligent effort, I would urge its immediate initiation. Perhaps, although I hope not, a 2-year extension of the draft would permit such a study to be pursued of necessity and at the end of this period then realistic and improved alternatives to this quite unsatisfactory draft law could be instituted.

I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in opposition to H.R. 2260 and I would welcome any questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Celeste, you have made it perfectly clear that you are opposed to peacetime compulsory military service. Do you favor compulsory military service in time of war?

Mr. CELESTE. Yes, I do, with alternatives for people such as conscientious objectors.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions?

Senator BARTLETT. I want to congratulate you, Mr. Celeste, for presenting your statement so effectively, and I want to congratulate your roommate also. I should note, Mr. Chairman, perhaps that I used to run a bulldozer. [Laughter.]

Chairman RUSSELL. All right, Mr. Celeste. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I didn't get to hear Mr. Celeste's testimony. I am impressed here in glancing through part of his statement and I think it is very timely, sir, for you to come here and present these views.

Mr. CELESTE. Thank you very much.

Senator STENNIS. We need testimony from outside sources and from young men.

Mr. CELESTE. I will measure my effectiveness by the action on the floor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Prof. William Newman, who will represent the National Council Against Conscription.

STATEMENT OF PROF. WILLIAM L. NEUMANN, NATIONAL COUNCIL AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

Mr. NEUMANN. I am William Neumann, a professional historian and a member of the history department at Goucher College.

I am speaking on behalf of the National Council Against Conscription, and I am pinch-hitting and I would be glad if the committee would accept a written statement later.

In this last year an American historian digging into the archives of the captured German state discovered that in the spring of 1945 a sizable section of German bureaucracies was very busy at a time that Russian tanks were pouring toward Berlin from the east and the American and British forces pouring in from the west, very busily engaged in estimating the paper clip requirements of the German forces for 1947-48. It is this same type of mentality of bureaucratic mentality and fixed frozen thinking that led the French during the 1930's to concentrate their energies on building up a massive Maginot line on a frontier which the Germans did not attack in any force in 1914. I am wondering whether the proposed drive for renewal of conscription does not represent for the United States the same type of irrelevant approach to a very vital problem.

We heard Secretary McElroy this week tell us that at the present time we do not have any defense against an intercontinental ballistic missile and we do not expect any defense in the near future.

Is a large conscript army going to do anything to effectively prepare for a thermonuclear war?

Will anything short of expenditure of billions of dollars, not mere billions to get this Nation underground, do anything vital for the defense of the United States, at the same time, of course, coupled with a very aggressive diplomacy to see if the real bases of tension can be eliminated.

Now, of course, the proponents of conscription do talk about the possibilities of limited war, or peripheral war, of brush-fire wars. But these possibilities are always discussed in terms of small well-armed, well-trained forces combating other small well-trained forces. If these wars go into mass armies, fighting mass armies, which means mass casualties, of course, the pressure to move into thermonuclear war will be tremendous.

The members of this committee remember, of course, during the Korean war the pressure which generated both in Congress and outside Congress to use thermonuclear weapons at a time when American casualties were rising rapidly. We have furthermore now the statement from Mr. Khrushchev that a limited war is an impossibility. Whether he means it or not we don't know, but he has made this statement. So it seems very difficult to find any real rational argument that conscription, the organization of a large mass army, in anyway contributes to national security. On the other hand, the abolition of conscription at this time may, while it does not in anyway weaken the military position of the United States, may be a sort of symbolic step which would contribute to the easing of tension, and Lord knows everyone is concerned with the easing of the tension between two great powers. I think that this is a place for Congress to show some leadership in this position.

It was a great war leader in World War I, Monsieur Clemenceau, who said war is much too serious a business to leave to the military.

Another great war leader, Mr. Churchill, repeated this in World War II. I think this is the role of Congress, to debate the question of conscription as to whether it does or does not contribute to national

security, and whether the abolition of conscription might be a more valid contribution to the world situation.

Thank you.

Senator STENNIS. Senator Case, do you have some questions?

Senator CASE. No questions.

Senator STENNIS. The chairman had to absent himself but on his behalf and on behalf of the committee we thank you for your testimony here this morning in coming to give us the benefit of these views.

Do you have a written statement you wish to file?

Mr. NEUMANN. I would like to submit a written statement.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Reporter, you will insert the gentleman's statement at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

I am testifying in behalf of the National Council Against Conscription, an organization of religious, educational, farm, and labor leaders. My name is William L. Neumann; I am a professional historian and professor of history at Goucher College.

An American historian who was recently examining the captured records of the Nazi Government of Germany discovered an amusing but characteristic example of bureaucratic foresight. In the late spring of 1945, while Russian tanks thundered toward Berlin and American tanks toward the Elbe, a section of the German planning organization busied itself in working out the merit requirements needed to supply the Government offices with paper clips for 1946. They continued at this task until the invading armies drove them from their desks. It was this same type of bureaucratic mind which led the French Government in the 1930's to pour their major military energies into building a magnificent fortification, the Maginot line, along a frontier which the Germans had not attacked heavily in 1914 and were to bypass completely in 1940.

It is in large part this same rigidity, this lack of contact with harsh realities, which leads the Pentagon bureaucracy in 1959 to call for the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. National security is indeed threatened, but the conscripting of hundreds of thousands of young men to be trained for 2 years in the rudiments of World War II warfare in no way diminishes that threat. Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy, in his testimony of March 2, 1959, before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, admitted that the United States has not now, nor will have in the next few years, any effective defense against long-range missiles bearing thermonuclear warheads. The Secretary went further to warn that even the future development of an antimissile would give no assurance that more than a modest number of attacking enemy missiles would be knocked down.

This is the reality which the Pentagon seems unwilling to face and which no millions of massed marching men can affect. The United States has only two choices in its quest for national security. The first is the development of a dynamic diplomacy which can through negotiation promise to remove the major causes of Russian-American tension and with the elimination of causes remove the threat of war. The alternative is to expend hundreds of billions of dollars, not just millions, to provide this Nation with deep underground shelters, complete with food and drink for months, and with air supplies which can remain free from the deadly radioactive dusts which will sweep the earth in the wake of thermonuclear war.

• There are those military experts who continue to hold nostalgic hopes for the possibility of fighting "limited wars" with conventional weapons. There may even be those who hope that the massed cavalry charge is not a thing of the past. But the proponents of "limited wars" do not claim that these conflicts will be fought between large conscript armies. In this event there would also be large casualty lists and in any war in which the casualty rate is high the pressure will be great on the nations involved to attempt to end the war by the use of thermonuclear weapons. One need only recall the rising pressure in the United States to use the atomic bomb to bring to an end the bloody sacrifices of the Korean war. The proponents of "limited wars" must also heed the warning of Mr. Khrushchev that any Russian-American war will become a thermonuclear war.

The civilian leadership of the United States must understand that it is war and the preparations for war which now provide the major threat to national security. War is the enemy. Strontium 90, the deadly byproduct of nuclear fission, knows no national boundaries and the Russians have made no boasts about possessing "clean bombs." Already the results of the Russo-British-American bomb tests have sent samples of the Minnesota wheat crop above the permissible level of radioactivity. Even if there are no further bomb tests this threat to human life will increase in intensity until 1970 when the major portions of atomic dust will have settled to earth. No amount of conscripts manning rifles, tanks, bazookas, or anti-aircraft guns will in anyway diminish the danger to the health of the present and future generations of Americans which preparations for war have already created.

A distinguished Columbia University scholar, C. Wright Mills, has pointed out in a brilliant book, "The Causes of World War III," that what passes for realism today is really "crackpot realism." The Pentagon which prides itself on its "realistic approach" to national security finds itself trying to cope with a 1959 threat to the Nation with 1939 techniques. In a world in which there is ample testimony from military experts from President Eisenhower downward that wars can no longer be "won" in the traditional sense, national security must be sought in a program of diplomacy which will provide security to both Russians and Americans and to the peoples in between.

The abolition of the Universal Military Training and Service Act would in no way weaken the military position of the United States and might well be a powerful move in setting American foreign relations on a new course. It would be viewed as a symbol of America's peaceful intentions throughout a now suspicious world. It would confront the Soviet Union with an action difficult to dismiss as propaganda. Followed by a policy of patient, continuous negotiation it would begin the process of achieving peace between the great powers.

It was a great French World War I leader, Premier Georges Clemenceau, who said that war was too serious a business to leave to the military. War and military policy have become an even more serious business in 1959. Congress has the responsibility and authority to reject the myopic view of the Pentagon and to deal with American military policy in terms of present realities.

Senator STENNIS. With the thanks of the committee, we appreciate your appearance.

Mr. Stuart Langton, United Christian Youth Movement. Come around, Mr. Langton.

Mr. Langton, I see you have a prepared statement here which is certainly a good idea.

You may read your statement or you may place it in the record and then emphasize the high points if you wish.

STATEMENT OF STUART LANGTON ON BEHALF OF UNITED CHRISTIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT

Mr. LANGTON. In consideration of the time and the fact that there are other people who would like to testify, I will be in Washington tomorrow morning and will be able to be here.

Senator STENNIS. That is very kind of you. We will just drive right on through here. Just have a seat. Do you wish to put your statement in the record?

Mr. LANGTON. Yes, and I would like to read it, sir.

Senator STENNIS. You have that choice. You may proceed.

Mr. LANGTON. Before I turn to my prepared testimony, sir, I would like to indicate that I believe that young people across this Nation are opposed to the draft. This is not just rebellion on the part of young people but it is well-founded. I would like to quote a statistic.

Senator STENNIS. You do not have to but you may sit down if you wish.

MR. LANGTON. This was taken by the Youth Research Institute published December 4, 1958, in the Des Moines, Iowa, Tribune. Young people were asked how they felt about the draft: "Do you think that the draft should be discontinued?" and 74 percent of the young men interviewed indicated that they thought that it should be continued.

Then asked: "Do you think that the pay scale should be raised to attract professionals?" The answer was 81 percent of the boys said "Yes."

Then the third question was: "Would you consider making the service a career?" Some 32 percent of the young men said "Yes," indicating that they would join the service and make it their career if it was a lucrative and appealing thing.

Now I would like to turn to my prepared statement. My name is Stuart Langton. I am the national chairman of the United Christian Youth Movement, a semiautonomous unit related to the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, but in its own right representing the youth fellowships of 30 major national denominations and serving well over 10 million young people all across the country.

Today we speak on behalf of our constituent youth fellowships.

Mr. Celeste has spoken on behalf of one of them, the National Conference of Methodist Youth. Our general mandate to represent our constituency on the issues before this committee can be well documented by official actions taken and reaffirmed over a period of 15 years.

As indicated by testimony before this and other committees of the Congress in 1948, 1950, 1952, and 1955, the United Christian Youth Movement, on the unanimous vote of its constituent communions, is unalterably opposed to the principle of permanent peacetime conscription as repugnant to the ideals of democracy and contrary to the way of love and reconciliation which is at the heart of our Christian faith.

While we recognize that the Universal Military Training and Service Act is not presently before this committee for consideration, legislation to extend its drafting provisions naturally raises all the basic questions which were discussed at the time that act was passed.

The seeming haste with which these hearings have been called, and the proposal to provide for a 4-year extension at this time, suggest to some of us that we have good reason to be concerned that the idea of permanent peacetime conscription not be established by cursory piecemeal legislation.

OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE MILITARY SITUATION

We recognize that we are not experts on military matters. On the other hand, testimony which spoke only to religious principles and convictions might be discounted by some as being idealistic and unrelated to the facts of life. The committee will appreciate that we are trying to deal with military considerations as we understand them.

American Christian youth recognize that national security is a legitimate and necessary concern of our Government. There would be some differences of opinion in our consistency on the best means to secure true security, but one conviction would stand clear. True and

ultimate security can never be comprehended in purely military terms.

Nevertheless, to the degree that military strength may be a component of some forms of national security we believe the present and proposed legislation is open to serious question.

1. It is not universal in its operation. When only about 125,000 out of nearly 2 million eligibles are involved in this universal obligation, an obvious element of discrimination must be faced. Those intelligent enough or affluent enough to continue formal education, those who marry early and have young children, those who enter certain professions—all these may find themselves deferred or exempt. Actually and increasingly the draft catches a larger percentage of those intellectually, socially or financially unable to escape it—which does not reflect well on its democratic administration nor portend well for the armed services which attempt to build national security out of slim second pickings.

2. It is not a good investment of the taxpayers' money. In 1953 the Defense Department estimated it cost \$11,000 per man to train these inductees. This figure is undoubtedly low for present computations but it nonetheless suggests a tremendous drain on the military budget without commensurate return.

Only about 3 percent of the draftees reenlist as contrasted with about 25 or 30 percent of the volunteers. That means that almost a billion dollars in trained manpower is lost each year in the person of those who leave service and need to be replaced. A program making career service attractive enough to hold these men would likely be attractive enough to get them to volunteer in the first place, making a draft unnecessary. That billion dollars could mean an additional \$500 to each man now in military service, each year, at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

3. It is not adequate to our modern military needs. While military minds are concerned over the possible need to face small wars as well as large ones, it still seems to be clear that tactical and strategic atomic weapons coupled with long-range missiles make the large military formations of the past obsolete. If our need is largely for a fairly manageable, highly competent, extremely well-trained force of technicians, it is clear we neither get them nor hold them through the draft system.

The most competent scientific and engineering students are rightly deferred or exempted. The persons we do draft and train as specialists are soon lost to the service. Even granting time for mobilization in any future emergency, the obsolescence of weapons as well as of trained manpower would make costly, time-consuming retraining necessary. As Gen. Curtis E. LeMay pointed out during the House Armed Services Committee hearings on this issue, an all-out nuclear war would last only 2 or 3 days and would be fought almost entirely by men in uniform when it began.

Therefore, a career-service technical force would be more capable of providing the backbone of military national security than a revolving-door collection of personnel in various stages of readiness working under poor motivation. When young men are poorly motivated and forced by induction to serve in the Armed Forces, it is known they are often bitter and antagonistic and often make poor soldiers.

4. It is misleading to our military leaders, our people, and other nations. The military must learn to think in terms of the future rather than the past. Large standing forces promote an illusion of strength that can dangerously mislead us regarding our true posture. Large standing forces seem to many always like a declaration of aggressive intent or potential, a misapprehension of our motives that we want neither our friends or enemies to have.

OUR MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CONCERNS

The democratic ideal, founded in the religious concept of the worth of each individual, makes individual choice and freedom of action a part of our priceless heritage. Every pressure which chips away at a person's right to decide for himself the ways in which he can or will best serve his society, by that much lessens our corporate freedom and undermines the roots of our national spirit and purpose.

We believe that matters pertaining to a person's individual moral code and practice (the bearing of arms, the possibility of killing or being killed) or to his individual vocational choice (career service, military science, humanitarian social service, etc.) are and should continue to be outside the purview of any government so long as the individual, in the exercise of his own rights, is respectful of the rights of others.

We are concerned that the continued tacit assumption of the right to draft men into military service in peacetime will tend to create an atmosphere in which Government will be permitted to increasingly invade the private lives of its citizens to the end that man will serve the state rather than the state serving man, or help to create an overbearing military system and attitude which will increasingly dominate our national life and, if the lessons of history ring true, lead to our downfall and decay.

We feel that the unsettling effects of the draft have already taken a heavy toll from our true posture of security. A nation is only as strong as the fabric of its life. By interrupting educational plans and career training, the draft has deprived our society of countless numbers of the trained persons it needs to continue healthy and growing.

By disrupting job possibilities for young people, the draft has contributed directly to idleness, temptation, and delinquency for many. By upsetting life plans and throwing the future into confusion, the draft and the general military atmosphere have tended to lead young people to feel that stability is an illusion and life pleasures need to be taken all at once lest they be missed entirely, with consequent weakening of our moral standards.

We are convinced that a continuing reliance on military means and military strength as the major avenue to national security is futile and most likely will lead to national destruction.

We see clearly that arms races, especially in a day of "ultimate weapons," are futile, wild-goose chases and an open invitation to catastrophe.

We know that armed existence in a hostile world is untenable even if our national policy or national spirit could abide such an option. We understand our future hope for peace with justice and security to

be inescapably linked with the legitimate hopes for peace with justice and security of all other peoples of the world.

We call upon our Government, before it is too late, to wake up to the fact that the world cannot be coerced militarily and economically into loving us or living with us as friends; to see the truth that the world cannot continue half slave, half free nor can it be at peace half hungry and ill-clad, half wallowing in surpluses.

We pray our leaders may see the folly, the trap, the dead end in their fixation on shining military hardware which blinds them to the fact that peace must be waged as hard and as expensively as war ever has been—or it will not be enough.

OUR OWN INVOLVEMENT

Let it be clear that we are not calling our Government to hard choices or expensive alternatives we are not prepared to accept for ourselves.

Our young people are vitally concerned about international affairs and are deeply involved in efforts to build understanding and good will.

Hundreds of them pay their own way and give of their time and energies in work projects of reconstruction and relief around the world.

The work camp program is a voluntary service that has contributed to better understanding, welfare, and peace among many nations and peoples. Thousands of young people are involved in various programs of exchange and visitation.

Literally millions of them give generously to funds for direct relief of critical need in all corners of this earth. Many thousands are seriously preparing for lifetime careers in social service, missionary work, international relations, and foreign or diplomatic service in an effort to make a positive contribution to world understanding.

These things our young people do voluntarily, without any compulsion save their personal concern for the world and its need.

They believe these efforts do more to promote true peace and therefore true national security than any draft legislation now or ever before this committee.

How much more would they do, and countless others of them and adults as well, if the Government were to creatively forsake its old reliance on military might and launch out on a bold new venture of world peace and reconciliation designed not to frighten the world but to serve it.

It is our belief that if, in contrast to a program of military conscription, the Government were to establish a voluntary program, providing opportunities for peaceful constructive service for better health, education, and welfare, taking into consideration some of these suggestions that were made this morning, then large numbers of men and women would be anxious to serve their Nation in this positive way and make a more lasting contribution to the long-range security and peace of our Nation and the world.

Before you dismiss all this as visionary, we would point out in closing that it is high time, at the middle of the 20th century that we stopped trying to deal with 21st century problems with 18th century concepts or programs.

Thank you, sir.

Senator STENNIS. I think you have a very good statement here indeed. I am glad to know that more of you are thinking on this vital matter, more of our young men who are willing to come here and testify.

Your last paragraph about the need for new approaches and putting young people into constructive programs, I think that that is one of the big questions before our country, how we are going to do that. I would like to see more of those that have the attitude you have on it in positions to carry it out.

Senator CASE, do you have any questions or any observations?

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions. Mr. Langton, has your group or the groups you represent made any survey to determine the response of young people if they had an opportunity to serve in a voluntary way in these constructive programs you suggest?

Mr. LANGTON. Yes. We are in contact with most all of our young people who do serve in these things, and the attitude is a very positive one. In the first place, they choose to take part and participate in these projects beforehand, and they feel that this is a wonderful experience in bringing better understanding among peoples of various backgrounds.

Senator CASE. What suggestion would you have, if any, for providing the men that are necessary to maintain a military establishment?

Mr. LANGTON. Sir, I believe if the program were appealing enough, and I think that the Air Force and Navy programs are appealing because they do have enough men who enlist and they don't need to use the draft—it seems to me if the Army could create a program that was a bit more attractive, that perhaps more young men would feel that they would like to participate. The first scope of that survey that was made indicates that 32 percent of young men interviewed said that they would make the service their career if it was appealing enough.

Senator CASE. If appealing enough, what kind of appeals would it have to have to be appealing enough?

Mr. LANGTON. First, sir, I think that it would have to have more of a financial appeal, and I appreciate that this committee in the past has tried to do this. I think that we need to continue efforts to do so. I think providing opportunities for financial gains in the service as well as educational things, more travel, this type of thing certainly is an inducement to any young man to become a part of the service.

And if he feels that in the services somehow contributing to a lasting peaceful contribution to his society, I feel that he would feel that this would be much more appealing than belonging to a military establishment that is only protecting and is being a destructive threat in the world.

Senator CASE. Do you think it is possible to have a military establishment and not have some units that have to do some of the more menial, less glamorous tasks?

Mr. LANGTON. No, sir; I believe that those tasks must be done also, and I believe that there are men who do volunteer and who do do these tasks and enjoy doing them.

Senator CASE. Do you think they would volunteer for these less attractive tasks?

Mr. LANGTON. Well, apparently some are and some men do volunteer and they do do these tasks, and from every indication it seems that perhaps they don't mind doing them.

Senator CASE. You referred to the Air Force and the Navy as getting their men to volunteer.

Do you think that any substantial portion of the men who join the Navy or the Air Force do so as a matter of choice because they fear if they do not they will be drafted and go into the Army?

Mr. LANGTON. Sir, that is a difficult value judgment to make, and I have heard some people say this and I have heard other people contradict it.

I think that there are many young men, and I know of many of my friends who do join the Air Force and the Navy who feel that this is a real career for them and they could have a real place in these two branches of the service, and they don't do it because they fear the draft. They feel that this is a good opportunity for them.

Senator STENNIS. Did you say they do not join because they fear the draft?

Mr. LANGTON. I am not sure if any do fear the draft. I suspect there might be some. This is a difficult value judgment to say one way or the other. But I do feel that many young men join because they see this as an opportunity for them and not because they fear the draft.

Senator CASE. Of course, it is a matter of terminology in saying they fear the draft or whether they regard these as more attractive. Possibly the Navy and the Air Force seem to offer them a more attractive service if they think it is a question of taking one of the three.

Mr. LANGTON. I am not sure I understand your question, sir.

Senator CASE. You suggested that you thought that there would be more volunteering if the services were made more attractive. And I am suggesting that possibly they regard the Navy or the Air Force as more attractive than the Army, and I wonder if part of the volunteering for the Air Force and the Navy is not because they regard it as the best of the choices before them?

Mr. LANGTON. I believe this is so, sir. If I was to enlist tomorrow, I believe that I would decide to join one of these services.

Senator CASE. How old are you?

Mr. LANGTON. I am 20, sir.

Senator CASE. You registered at 18 or 18 and a half?

Mr. LANGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. Are you going to school now?

Mr. LANGTON. I am a student at Boston University. I am another citizen of Massachusetts, sir.

Senator CASE. If you don't want to answer this question, don't, because I am not seeking to embarrass you in any way, but I was just wondering as a personal matter if you could give us the benefit of how you regard the situation for yourself. Do you contemplate entering the service when you complete college?

Mr. LANGTON. Sir, this has been a very difficult question for me as I am sure it has been for countless hundreds and thousands of young people across the country. I myself am now in the process of being classified as 1-A, which means that I will participate in the service and I can be drafted tomorrow. I have now continued to seek my educa-

tion and finish it. I hope to go to seminary and then get my Ph. D. after that.

In case of war, sir, I would enlist as a chaplain. Does that answer your question?

Senator CASE. Yes, it does and I appreciate your frank answer. As I say I was not trying to embarrass you or make this personal except to illustrate this problem, and it is a real personal problem with every young man who is in college or who is in the process of getting an education. Some young people have more definite thoughts as to their educational program than others.

Would it improve the Selective Service Act if the age for registration were changed, in your judgment, making it 19 rather than 18½?

Mr. LANGTON. I believe 18 is a good age for registration, sir.

Senator CASE. You think it is a good age for registration?

Mr. LANGTON. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. Do the young men as you know them regard the period of Reserve liability after service as any particular encumbrance in their plans?

Mr. LANGTON. I can only speak personally here, sir, and the young men that I know feel that it is an obligation for them and often they do resent having to spend so much time each week or each month and each summer in Reserve units, and they feel that a lot of these are motions that they are sorry that they have to go through, and they have difficulty understanding how this contributes to national security.

Senator CASE. The observation has been made to me that some young men feel it is sort of a double jeopardy. That if they serve 2 years in the service and then have the Reserve liability, that they have a greater likelihood of being called upon if reservists are needed than those who are not trained. The suggestion has been made to me that there would be a feeling that it was fairer if those who served 2 years or whatever the time might be, if there, their liability could be regarded as discharged then, and further, that if those who are to have a Reserve liability could have a shorter period of initial service, and then carry the Reserve liability over a longer period of time, that it would tend to equalize the responsibility and avert the demand, so to speak. Have you any comment on that?

Mr. LANGTON. That might be true, sir, as I have mentioned in my testimony, the problem with the Reserve is that it leaves men in various stages of readiness, and as General LeMay has pointed out to the House, that in any sort of a war that we might have today, that then it would be fought most entirely by those already in the Armed Forces full time, and this would last for a period of 2 or 3 days.

Senator CASE. Either those in full time or those subject to immediate call such as a National Guard unit?

Mr. LANGTON. I believe he indicated those full time.

Senator CASE. Do you have any suggestions for the amendment of the act in connection with its extension?

Mr. LANGTON. No specific words to put before you, but only these, I guess.

Senator CASE. Your general philosophy that we ought to engage in more constructive tasks and not depend so much on the military approach in solving world problems, that is excellent, but we do have the problem here of a bill having been passed by the House which proposes to extend the draft and all it does is to change the dates

and extend the 4 years as it is. But you have probably pointed out that then it raises the question of the provisions of the act. This is the time to propose amendments if we are going to have the act amended.

Mr. LANGTON. Well, sir, of course as I have indicated, it would make our constituents feel very happy if the act was not passed. However, if it is passed as overwhelmingly as it was in the House, it would seem to us that certainly we would want to do one thing which is to study this whole area more closely than we have in the past or give it more time and more true consideration, not be influenced as greatly by our military concerns as we have been in the past, to look into these kinds of things.

In the House of Representatives, Representative Wolf introduced a bill which would extend this for 2 years and he proposed a study committee of Members of the House and the Senate to look into this, and I think that this was an admirable suggestion, to begin to get to the real roots of the problem and also to maintain adequate defense needs, as this committee and the House apparently sees it.

Senator CASE. You don't have any specific suggestions then for amendment of the act in its extension, whether for 2 years, 1 year or 4 years?

Mr. LANGTON. I hope that it will be defeated.

Senator CASE. You may hope that but under the present situation with as many tension points as there are in the world, I think that the likelihood of its being defeated are practically nil.

Mr. LANGTON. Then I would hope that there would be provisions for young men to enter teaching and these other things as we have indicated.

Senator CASE. You see we are confronted with the fact that the act will expire in 2 months. We are about to go perhaps into a summit conference or a conference of Foreign Ministers on the Berlin situation. I can't believe, being realistic about it, that there will be any defeat of the legislation. I don't think that a majority of the Senate would say to the President or the Secretary of State "You go into these conferences facing the fact that we have voted to discontinue the Selective Service Act." They would feel we were disarming them and weakening their position in the conference. So the only practical choice that we have here now is to extend the act either as it is or with some modifications, and if you have any specific suggestions for that, I would certainly be glad to receive them.

Mr. LANGTON. In view of these things, sir, I believe that one of the great needs is to get a better understanding of this and to look into it much more deeply than we have, to have more Members of the Congress look at it and to arouse more civilian concern and interest in the matter.

I would think that a good suggestion would be if this is passed, to have a study committee consider this as was suggested in the House and as I have mentioned before, which would consider views of groups such as myself as well as military groups which do disagree on this matter.

But it would provide for a committee that would look into it much more concretely and would come out with some specific suggestions.

Senator CASE. Thank you very much.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to receive your testimony, Mr. Langton. The next witness will be Mrs. William E. Brainard of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Have a seat, Mrs. Brainard. You may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM E. BRAINARD, WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM, ACCOMPANIED BY ANNA LEE STEWART

Mrs. BRAINARD. I am Mrs. William E. Brainard, of Providence Road, Towson, Md. I am here today representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. section.

This international organization was founded in 1915 with Jane Addams as its first president. Throughout its history it has maintained a policy and program consistent with its purpose to work by nonviolent means for the establishment throughout the world of those political, economic, social, and psychological conditions which can assure peace and freedom.

I thank you for this opportunity to express the testimony of this organization.

The league has always opposed peacetime conscription which is inconsistent to American traditions. It is tolerated by public opinion only when people are satisfied that the draft is necessary and that it is being carried out in a way that is scrupulously fair.

Millions of Americans today are not satisfied on either of these points. Others can present, with good evidence, reasons for opposing the extension of the draft based on its inefficiency, wastefulness, and discriminatory practices (as so ably outlined in the Nation's Business published by the chamber of commerce, November 1958).

We recognize these reasons and share these concerns, but the league believes that there are even more serious reasons for opposing the extension of the draft and any form of universal, compulsory, military training.

Furthermore, the league, first and foremost, is convinced that basic problems of the world are not susceptible to military solutions and believes that compulsory military training undermines our basic democratic tradition by interfering with the individual liberties of young citizens and indoctrinates them with a military approach to problems.

We believe that the extension of the draft will not contribute to the strength of our Nation but will weaken it, not only by its effect on our young people, and on our American society, but also by the likelihood of its endangering world peace.

It encourages them to do only what they are compelled to do, make them become expert at letting George do it. This weakens the moral fiber of our Nation and our whole American society as well as I think endangering world peace. Initiative and independent thinking have been the source, the pride, and the strength of our country's development as a great democracy. The great asset of the American people in the past has been their pioneering spirit and their ability to make creative responses to new situations.

We believe that compulsory military training, instead of strengthening our people, weakens our moral fiber. Moreover, putting our young citizens under the control of the military power of the Government interferes with the individual liberties and basic freedoms of a people traditionally opposed to such infringements of their democratic rights. Twenty-five percent of college students are veterans; then there are the ROTC students and their families.

The reason so many people accept unquestioningly peacetime conscription in a democracy is that the powerful military agencies have convinced them of its necessity. There has been evidence of the tremendous growth of the military in many phases of American life; in its influence on foreign policy; in lessened civilian control of Armed Forces; in placement of military officers in key posts in the Department of State; and in its influence on mass consciousness made possible by propaganda through the press, motion pictures, radio and television.

So thoroughly have these resources been used that the mass mind today accepts this military culture with little organized protest. This would have been unthinkable 50 or even 20 years ago when citizens more generally recognized that peacetime conscription and democracy are incompatible.

But the mass mind has been persuaded that we have just one problem: a military enemy, and that there is just one answer: the military answer.

Young people have been persuaded that they owe just one kind of service to their country: military service. No people can turn the important decisions of life and national policy over to its military forces without the danger of control by them.

It is time to start reversing that trend in our country; one such step would be the ending of the draft and of compulsory military service. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom believes that ending the peacetime draft could help ease international tension, promote political settlements and disarmament agreements, and release men and resources to concentrate on the real needs of the world's people.

What we need in the United States of America is not a conformity of thinking molded by the military authorities, but constant opportunities for free choices and free discussions. We need an understanding of what the real problems of the world are and opportunities to discover new and better ways of meeting these problems.

WHERE THE RESPONSIBILITY LIES

If you think this is conjuring up a mythical concern, and if you think there is no danger in the growing power of the military in this country, ask yourself whether or not Congress agrees too quickly with the Pentagon's demands. A Senator, independent in his thinking in some areas, when questioned recently about the extension of the draft, replied that he took without question the recommendation of the Defense Department.

As a citizen in a democracy, we expect our representatives to question any department of the executive branch. Some Congressmen are irritated by the exercise of its constitutional power by the Supreme

Court. Why are they not alarmed by the more overwhelming use of power by the Pentagon?

We recognize that it is not the purpose of the Defense Department to be concerned primarily with weighing individual rights and our traditional freedoms against the Nation's security—as they see it—but it cannot abdicate its responsibility for the impact on society of the policies and practices.

When the Pentagon gets so absorbed, however, in its military defense job and its own power that it fails to see what kind of totalitarian, controlled society we are becoming, then it becomes the responsibility of civilian leaders, Members of Congress, committees such as this, to recognize the dangers and to see the needs of the country—and of the world as a whole—and in perspective. It is time to question, not to endorse, its proposals.

What is so serious about this situation?

The fact is that the problems of the world are not military problems at all. Look at Asia: The problem we have been facing, and still face in Asia is the result of a revolt against imperialism, hunger, poverty, ignorance, and against inequality.

The problem is not one of stopping these revolts but of resolving them with democratic methods and solutions. This is essentially a political, economic, and educational task rather than a military one.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the United States must try to forestall the economic dissatisfaction and political dissatisfaction that led to armed uprising rather than wait for possible military action.

The new democracy of India is struggling with gigantic problems: Literacy, disease, food supplies, industrialization, as well as communism. Helping India meet the needs of her people will do more to solve the problems we face in Asia, including the defeat of communism, than any military proposals or program of conscription. Whether we look at the Middle East or the Berlin crisis, it becomes apparent that the solutions to the underlying problems lie in the nonmilitary sphere.

Certainly if we are to keep the friendship of Latin American and of African countries, we need far more than military preparedness, programs, and methods.

President Eisenhower in his November 10, 1958, speech before the Colombo Plan Conference in Seattle, emphasized that the purpose of the United States is to support world economic growth in our common struggles against human want and human suffering.

We can't win the hearts and minds of people by bayonets or bombs. As Vice President Nixon said on January 27, 1959—

We can be the strongest military power in the world and still lose the struggle for the world without a missile being launched if we don't have the vision—

to understand the basic economic and political problems, and seek their solution.

Many civilian leaders of our country appreciate that we must demonstrate what democracy and brotherhood really mean; that the present emphasis on military solutions is unrealistic and shortsighted.

There is another reason the emphasis of our Nation on a military solution fails to build peace and freedom. Such stress on military force keeps other countries from understanding our real desire for peace.

It isn't a question of the motives of U.S. foreign policy, but the implementation; the methods we use made us appear warlike rather than peace loving. The United States has an opportunity to exert real world leadership.

Discontinuation of the draft here could be followed by American efforts for the international abolition of conscription. In the midst of a prolonged cold war, without more clear-cut affirmative acts for peace, it is hard for either side to convince the other that it really wants peace.

Ending the peacetime draft could help ease international tensions, promote political settlements and disarmament agreements, and release men and resources to help concentrate on the real needs of the world's people.

Is there a constructive alternative?

Of course there is. Victor Reuther, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April 1958 said:

The more young Americans we can make available throughout the world as technical missionaries with slide rules, with medical kits, with textbooks, to fight communism on a positive basis, the fewer young Americans we will need to send with guns and flamethrowers to fight on the battlefields of the world.

He called on the Senate to establish a system of scholarships which would give 100,000 of our most promising graduates opportunity of joining an "enlistment for peace."

These young volunteers for peace, trained in the languages, cultures, and technical skills required, would constitute a human reserve from which the United Nations and the underdeveloped areas could draw in fighting hunger, ignorance, and disease.

Does this seem too radical a departure from the concept of conscript service? It would give to the youth an opportunity to develop a sense of moral adventure, initiative, achievement in helping create for others as well as themselves a real security based on peace, freedom, and justice for all.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom deplores the speed with which the House passed the extension of the draft. There was inadequate notice of the hearings, inadequate time for hearing all points of view, and inadequate time for debate on the floor on an issue which so vitally affects the American people as well as the U.S. national policy.

The league urges the Senate, as the weightier, more deliberative body, to allow ample time to consider all points of view, as well as time for full debate of the issue on the floor of the Senate.

Jane Addams, whose 100th anniversary we anticipate celebrating in 1960, has put it well:

What, after all, has maintained the human race on this old globe, despite all the calamities of nature and all the tragic failure of mankind, if not faith in new possibilities and courage to advocate them?

I might like to add a few words with reference to the two young men who testified here this morning. I have three grown sons, students, who would concur with Mr. Celeste from Yale. They are very anxious to be of service to their country and to the world and they would like an opportunity to do constructive work meeting the needs of people.

Chairman RUSSELL. I can assure you, as far as I am concerned, that I will try to see that everyone has the fullest opportunity to debate

on this bill on the floor of the Senate as you advocate, Mrs. Brainard. This is the International League for Peace and Freedom. You represent the U.S. section, and do you have sections in many other countries?

Mrs. BRAINARD. Yes.

Mrs. STEWART. We have members and sections in 42 countries. Our newest branch is in Ghana. We have a section in India, one in Israel, Japan, the Scandinavian countries, European countries, Great Britain, Canada, and members in Latin America.

Chairman RUSSELL. Have you been able to get into the Soviet Union with a section?

Mrs. STEWART. No totalitarian country would permit this organization. We believe in the democratic process of the right of the citizen to speak out and the responsibility of the citizen to speak out in support of good policies and to criticize or offer constructive alternatives to the others and I think no totalitarian state would welcome the vigor with which we work.

Chairman RUSSELL. So often witnesses like you and Mrs. Brainard come here and present a viewpoint that is very tempting. You present a program that has great appeal to us but we are presented it unilaterally. For that reason I thought maybe we might be able to get behind the Iron Curtain and bring about some understanding, but let us follow our natural bent in preferences and do away with all the Military Establishments and vote all the money spent on it to improving the lot of mankind.

Mrs. STEWART. I should say, Senator, we do have some members in Czechoslovakia, and have had in Poland, though not active branches because of the kind of government they have at present. But I would say that we have supported universal disarmament through the United Nations and international abolition of conscription because we believe the burden of arms should be lifted from the whole world and we want the United States to take more initiative in this area.

The United States has taken some, but we believe this is the time to put more effort in that direction, the redirection of foreign policy rather than continuing what seems to us an arms race which according to moral law and history has ended in war and not peace.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am very strongly in favor of universal disarmament and peace, but I have never been able to believe that unilateral action on the part of the United States would bring us to that goal.

I am afraid it would bring us instead to slavery.

Mrs. BRAINARD. The British have set up a committee to follow a similar line of action which has been proposed and which has already, I think, been set up in the House to make a study of this volunteer versus conscript. I would like to really emphasize that there are many proposals that we do not take your time to present, but are available for your serious study.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have had a number of suggestions, some of them very thought provoking, that have been brought to our attention.

Any questions?

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, just one. How do you keep the organization going?

Is there an active effort to get branches in various countries at the present time?

Mrs. BRAINARD. I think our organization grows primarily by personal contacts. We don't go out and make a membership drive or try to convert somebody. We are always meeting people who say, "We agree with that and we would like to join."

Senator CASE. Do you have any international gatherings at the present time?

Mrs. BRAINARD. Yes, every 2 years we have an international congress. We have one coming this summer to be held in Stockholm. We have an international executive that meets every year so that we do get the opinions of women.

Senator CASE. Where was the last one held 2 years ago?

Mrs. STEWART. It was held 3 years ago in Birmingham, England. It is every 3 years. It will be held in Stockholm this year and preceding it we have a seminar of young people. We have an international summer school with a grant from UNESCO and our international office, Senator Case, is in Geneva where we have consultants at the U.N., an observer for the international section at United Nations all the time here in the United States and one in Geneva who also goes to Rome for FAO as we also have consulting status with the Food and Agricultural Organization, World Health Organization, and a number of these other agencies of the United Nations. We have been in existence 44 years and the international office being in Geneva has people who go from there and some of our members from other sections travel in other countries. We have found also at the U.N. here that a number of the delegates from other countries have said:

Since the women are now getting the vote and taking political action in our countries—

this is particularly true of newly developing countries—

we want to know more about your organization because you stand as an international interracial organization with no barriers between yourselves and others.

And they feel it is an opportunity to make democracy work within a woman's organization.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, I notice that Mrs. Brainard referred to an article in the Nation's Business which is published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the issue for November of 1958. I did not have an opportunity to read that article. I wonder if the staff could not obtain that for us and put it in the hearings as a part of the record of the hearings.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am advised that our efficient staff has already obtained that article.

Senator CASE. Is it intended that it be made a part of the hearings?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes, I see no objection to that.

Senator CASE. I think it might be handy for reference.

Chairman RUSSELL. It is not a very lengthy article. It will be printed in the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

[From Nation's Business, published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., November 1958]

DRAFT LAW ISSUES: WASTE, UNFAIRNESS

PUBLIC REACTION AND CHANGED MILITARY NEEDS MAKE MILITARY MANPOWER TOP TASK FOR CONGRESS

Rewriting the Nation's military manpower laws will be a priority task when the new Congress convenes in January.

Authority to draft men into the Armed Forces expires on July 1, 1959. A month later the basic Reserve forces statute, enacted in 1955, expires.

Businessmen have a fourfold interest in what Congress does about these laws.

As citizens, they are concerned with providing Armed Forces that are adequate, both in quality and quantity, to the requirements of national security in an era of rapid advance in weapons technology.

As taxpayers, they are concerned with staffing the Armed Forces in an economical and efficient way.

As employers, they are concerned with minimizing the disruptive effects of military service on civilian careers, and with avoiding an excessive drain on manpower resources.

As parents, they want to be sure that the draft and Reserve programs operate fairly, and that they do not exact unnecessary or unreasonable sacrifices from any young American.

Devising new legislation that meets all of these tests will be difficult. Congress may be tempted to take the easy way out by pushing through a simple extension of the present laws. This temptation must be resisted for two reasons:

1. Peacetime conscription is deeply repugnant to American traditions. It is tolerated by public opinion only when people are satisfied that the draft is necessary and that it is being carried out in a way that is scrupulously fair. Millions of Americans today are not satisfied on either of these points.

2. Radical changes in military strategy and manpower requirements have taken place since the present draft and Reserve laws were enacted. In the words of Thomas R. Reid, Ford Motor Co. executive who heads the manpower subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the assumptions on which the 1955 laws were based are now "obsolete."

The basic assumption of the 1955 laws is that the Nation's need for trained military manpower can be met only by compelling every qualified youth to serve. It is clearly reflected in the official title of the draft law which is not the Selective Service Act but the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

It places on all physically and mentally qualified men between the ages of 18½ and 26 a legal obligation to perform at least 6 years of military service. This may be fulfilled by various combinations of Active and Reserve duty—the Armed Forces currently offer 34 alternative enlistment programs. Theoretically, any qualified youth who fails to sign up for one of these programs will be drafted for 2 years of active duty.

The flaw in this universal service plan is that it cannot be applied fairly without yielding far more manpower than the armed services need or want.

A little arithmetic will show why this is true.

In 1955, the number of youths flowing into the draft-age manpower pool was 1.1 million a year. About 300,000 of these were physically or mentally disqualified for military service. That left 800,000.

The Armed Forces at that time had an active-duty strength of 2.8 million. To maintain this strength, they were taking in from civilian life about 600,000 men a year—through the draft, through draft-stimulated enlistments, and through callup of reservists.

Congress saw a prospective surplus of 200,000 men a year. So it wrote into the law a program which a House program committee report frankly labeled a control factor over the manpower pool. This is the now-famous 6-months' training plan, under which a youth can avoid being drafted by signing up directly in a National Guard or Reserve unit for 6 months' active-duty training followed by several years in drilling Reserve status.

Several factors have rendered this plan obsolete.

New weapons, including missiles, have sharply altered military strategy and have reduced the need for massed manpower. The services this year are paring down to an active-duty strength of 2.5 million men. This strength can be maintained with a total intake of 450,000 civilians a year, or 150,000 less than were needed in 1955.

The postwar baby boom is beginning to be reflected in the late teen-age groups. The number of youths reaching the threshold age of 18½ rose this year to 1.2 million; by 1960, it will be 1.3 million; by 1965, nearly 2 million.

Finally, the Armed Forces have displayed a marked lack of enthusiasm for 6 months trainees as a source of manpower for the Ready Reserve. Instead of the 250,000 a year authorized by Congress, the services this year took in only 55,000. The largest number they have accepted in any year since the law was passed was 95,000.

The net result of all this has been to confront Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey and his 4,000 local draft boards with an embarrassment of riches. They are trying to enforce a law which envisions universal military service in a period when the Armed Forces are no longer interested in training every able-bodied youth, even for Reserve duty. This dilemma has been solved—if such an expedient can be termed a solution—by rigging the manpower pool.

By Presidential order, all youths who become fathers before induction are automatically moved to the bottom of the callup list. General Hershey can rightly say that they have not been exempted from the draft, because they are theoretically still classified I-A. But with draft calls running at a level of 10,000 a month, there is no conceivable likelihood of their actually being called. About one youth out of six is beating the draft via this escape hatch.

Two young men out of every six are avoiding service on grounds of physical or mental unfitness. General Hershey suspects that some of them are deliberately flunking the mental examinations which are formulated and administered by the Army at induction stations. The flunk rate will almost certainly show a substantial rise in coming months as a result of a law, passed at the last session of Congress, which authorizes the Army to raise the present passing grade on mental tests. With an abundance of I-A's awaiting call, local draft boards have been liberal in granting deferments to students and to vital workers in agriculture and industry. Anyone who gets such a deferment theoretically remains liable for induction until he is 35 years old. But by Executive order, men with this extended liability go to the bottom of the callup list, along with the fathers, as soon as they turn 26. So the actual prospect of being inducted is virtually nil.

MORE THAN HALF THE MEN OF DRAFT AGE DO NOT SERVE UNDER UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Other relatively small groups of youths are draftproof because they are clergymen, divinity students, aliens, public officials, conscientious objectors, or sole surviving sons of families bereaved by war. This brings us to an eye-opening fact:

Less than half of the young men in the draft age group are actually seeing military service under the present universal service laws.

The public is increasingly aware of this fact. That's why Congressmen, stumping the hustings this fall, have heard so much grumbling about the "unfair" and "discriminatory" draft.

Meanwhile, the draft is under heavy attack from another quarter. A growing body of Americans, including some business leaders, believe that the draft is an inefficient, and, in the long run, uneconomical way of filling military manpower needs.

These Americans have rallied around the professional-forces concept outlined last year by a high-level Defense Department study committee. The committee was headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, then president and now chairman of General Electric Co., and included a number of other prominent business executives.

According to the committee, the real personnel problem in the Armed Forces today is quality rather than quantity.

"Strategy and tactics are undergoing radical change," the report said. "Yet, strangely enough, the principles and practices which guide the recruitment, motivation, compensation, and development of men have not changed substantially in the history of our country.

"It is foolish for the Armed Forces to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate, and to maintain such equipment. * * *

"The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities."

Congress responded to the Cordiner report by enacting this year a military pay bill which granted raises of at least 6 percent to all men with more than 2 years service, and which set up a brand new proficiency pay system under which the services will henceforth offer incentive pay boosts, ranging up to \$150 a month, for specialists and technicians.

Although this pay bill is expected to cut losses of highly skilled servicemen who have been trained at great expense, Pentagon leaders say emphatically that it will not eliminate the need for draft authority.

"The draft is still absolutely essential if we are to maintain the military strength levels that are necessary for national security," says Charles C. Finucane, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Mr. Finucane says the Army has concluded, from extensive recent studies, that it could not maintain a strength of more than 535,000 men on the basis of voluntary enlistments alone. The Army's present authorized strength is 870,000 men.

While the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are now meeting all their requirements through voluntary enlistment, Mr. Finucane says, "these services admit that their success in recruiting has been at least partly due to the stimulus of the draft."

He adds that "draft-inspired volunteers" are also of crucial importance in keeping the National Guard and other Ready Reserve components up to strength.

Mr. Finucane agrees that professional Armed Forces, composed entirely of volunteers, would be vastly preferable to a partially conscripted military establishment.

"Modern Armed Forces require increasingly larger proportions of technical and skilled manpower—jobs requiring extensive and expensive periods of training. We know that enlisting men voluntarily for 3, 4, or more years produces a more effective force at less cost than inducting them for 2 years. We have been trying for the past several years to make military service more attractive in order to increase our voluntary enlistment and reenlistment rates."

He ticked off some of the career incentive measures placed in effect during the past 4 years—improved survivor benefits, medical care for dependents, better housing, larger reenlistment bonuses, dislocation allowances on change of station, Government-guaranteed home loans, and better promotion opportunities.

As a result of these measures, Mr. Finucane says, reenlistment rates have improved appreciably. The average reenlistment rate for first-term regulars (the most critical retention group) rose from 15.7 percent in fiscal 1955 to 27 percent in fiscal 1958.

"We hope that all of these career incentive programs will eventually require less and less resort to compulsory military service," he says. "But it would be folly to abolish the draft next year in the mere hope that volunteer programs would do the job."

Outside the Pentagon, several proposals have been made for speeding the day when the services can rely entirely on professional volunteers.

One is to raise the starting pay of recruits, which the Cordiner pay bill left untouched at \$78 a month.

Dr. J. K. Galbraith, Harvard economics professor, believes that the increases in basic pay required to attract much larger numbers of men to the Armed Forces would not be astronomic.

Another suggestion, from a study sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, is to make more widespread use of civilian personnel and civilian contractors in construction, procurement, warehousing, supply, transportation, housekeeping and recordkeeping operations, thereby reducing the need for men in uniform.

If one accepts the Pentagon position that some kind of draft law will continue to be necessary after mid-1959, the next question is what changes are needed to bring the law into reasonable conformity with actual military requirements and to make it more equitable in operation.

Here is where Defense Department manpower experts part company with General Hershey.

Defense officials are greatly concerned about the rising age level of inductees. In an effort to maintain the congressionally decreed concept of universality of service, draft boards are filling their quotas with the oldest eligibles on their lists. But as the pool of surplus 1-A's grows, the average age of the men being

called creeps steadily higher. It is now about 22 years and 9 months. This is at least 3 years and 9 months past what the military regard as the prime age for recruits.

There is growing sentiment in the Pentagon for two fundamental changes in the law. They call for:

1. Reducing draft age limits so that a youth is liable to callup for only about 2 years after his 18th birthday, instead of remaining eligible until he is 26 (or until he is 35 if he gets a deferment).

2. Recognizing that the Armed Forces need only a fraction of the youths in the draft age group, and selecting by lot those to serve.

These changes would achieve several results. They would insure the Army's getting the younger men it wants. They would ease public criticism that the present draft throws a pall of uncertainty over a youth's life for an intolerably long period. Finally, they would end the hypocrisy of the universal service slogan, and would put the selection of draftees on a basis that Americans have traditionally regarded as the fairest possible.

There is, however, one flaw. It is spotlighted by General Hershey's question to an interviewer:

"Are you going to have a real lottery * * * or a phony one?"

To General Hershey, a real lottery means actually inducting the man whose number comes up—unless he is found to be grossly unfit for any kind of service. It means wiping out the special categories—students, essential workers, fathers, and so forth—and throwing all able-bodied men into the pool from which the choice would be made by lot.

General Hershey well knows that the Pentagon is likely to balk at such a lottery. What the Army manpower planners really want is to continue the present system of screening out all of the less desirable draft candidates—the fathers who would rate dependents' allowances, the men who may need a lot of dental care or arch-supporting shoes, the slow learners who create problems for training instructors (just as they create problems for high school teachers and shop foremen). The lottery would then be applied to those who are left.

In General Hershey's view, this would be just as discriminatory as the present system.

General Hershey acknowledges that the present draft setup is not ideal, but he believes that many complaints voiced against it would disappear if the Defense Department would operate the 6-month trainee program at the 250,000-men-a-year level authorized by Congress. This would soak up a lot of the surplus in the 1-A pool and slow the rise in the average age of inductees.

It would also, General Hershey says, provide the Nation with something that it needed badly at the time of the Korean war and may need again—a large reservoir of Ready Reservists who are trained but have not served.

Defense officials would prefer to move in the opposite direction if they could.

The 1955 law authorized a Ready Reserve of 2.9 million men, and provided elaborate arrangements for channeling into it, not only 6-months trainees, but draftees and enlistees at the conclusion of their active duty service. Provision was made for enforcing the obligation of Ready Reservists to participate in regular drill sessions, under penalty of being called to active duty or even being court-martialed.

This much publicized paraphernalia for compelling service in the drilling reserve has come to a rather farcical end. The plain fact is that the Armed Forces are unwilling to invest their limited defense dollars in a Ready Reserve force of the size Congress contemplated. Less than 1 million men are now on drill pay status—which is the real criterion for determining who is in the quick callup components of the Reserve. The Defense Department tried valiantly this year to reduce the total still further by making 10 percent cuts in National Guard and Army Reserve personnel drawing drill pay. But an uproar from State Governors and Congress blocked the move.

The situation at present is that the Ready Reserve components generally have more men who are eager to draw drill pay than they have vacancies. Once in a while they have to invoke the compulsory clause to avoid the ultimate scandal of a 6-month trainee abandoning the weekly drill periods which alone bring his service into rough balance with the draftee's 2 years of active duty. But there is little point in threatening to recall or court-martial a former draftee or enlistee who fails to keep up the 3 or 4 years of post graduate drilling reserve participation which ostensibly is required of him by the 1955 law.

Obviously, both the draft and reserve laws have already been amended by history. The only question now is whether Congress will lend history a hand, and try to put our military manpower statutes on a fair and rational footing.

LOUIS CASSELS.

Mrs. BRAINARD. Here is a copy, Senator Case, if you would like to have it right away.

Chairman RUSSELL. The next witness is Mr. Bernard Bolitzer, who represents the Social Democratic Federation of the Socialist Party.

Have a seat, Mr. Bolitzer. This seems to be a letter from Mr. Norman Thomas.

STATEMENT OF BERNARD BOLITZER, SOCIALIST PARTY, SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION

Mr. BOLITZER. That is right. I am going to read a letter written by Mr. Norman Thomas.

Chairman RUSSELL. Very well, we will accept this. It is not technically correct but we won't split hairs on it.

Mr. BOLITZER (reading) :

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: As a democratic socialist I should admit a power of government for conscription of property which I should deny for the conscription of men. Our chief criticism of totalitarianism, Fascist or Communist, is its denial of the rights which give dignity to men. In our own time we have seen the power of conscription stretched by totalitarians into an imposition and justification of actual slavery to the State. I do not allege that the selective service law will inevitably lead America down that dark road. But these are not times to grant the national state power to conscript except perhaps in a kind of emergency which does not exist.

This statement is supported by the action of the British Government which has announced that it will not use its conscription law after 1960 and that the law itself will expire in 1962. If Britain can attract the necessary number of men to military service without conscription certainly the United States can do as well.

I listened with interest to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey argue for the 4-year extension of the Selective Service Act over the television program, "Today." He did not argue that the law was necessary to fill the ranks of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

His contention was that its existence stimulated voluntary enlistment and that it was valuable because it gave him, in behalf of the Government, far-reaching control not only for the men drafted for immediate military service, but over great numbers of our youth who might be drafted should they change their minds about the particular work or study for which they have been excused. To accept this sort of thing is a far cry from the American tradition.

Various responsible men including Adlai Stevenson in his presidential campaign have challenged the efficiency of selective service for its own ends. The Cordiner report of May 1957 was quite emphatic on this subject. It estimated on the basis of figures submitted by the Armed Forces that an Armed Force paid as adequately as are other Government and civilian workers would result in sufficient voluntary enlistments to permit a reduction in the size of Armed Forces especially in training and transportation personnel as well as a 10 percent cutback in maintenance technicians and reductions at other points. The total saving in material and maintenance would go from about \$5.5 billion in 1960 to \$6.6 billion in 1962.

Part of the waste in conscription, as the Cordiner report points out, lies in the fact that conscription has helped Congress, the Pentagon, and the President to dodge many problems connected with the proper maintenance of the Army and its morale.

Mr. Cordiner alleged that since 97 out of every 100 draftees leave the Army as soon as their 2-year terms end, and since the advances in modern war technology make it almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years, the men are being discharged about the time they become useful.

This would not be true of a properly recruited force. Mr. Cordiner also reported, after talking to hundreds of enlisted men, that he found antagonism and bitterness over the draft.

This is the more true because the men cannot feel that selective service imposes anything like a uniform burden on youth. Many men feel that it almost pays in freedom from the draft to have some physical defect or low IQ. There is a justifiable concern over the ease with which American boys, taken prisoners in Korea, were broken by the Communists in spirit and intelligent devotion to their country and its ideals. Is that fact not to some extent to be explained by the circumstances or selective service conscription and the experience of the men who undergo its training?

It has been further charged that, as a result of inexperienced men handling intricate weapons and equipment, the accident rate is so high that close to \$5 billion worth of equipment is now inoperable. (I have taken most of these facts from the somewhat extensive statement on the "Cost of Conscription" published by the National Council Against Conscription. The whole report is doubtless before you.)

Unless some of these objections to conscription can be better refuted than in any statement I have seen, Congress is exceedingly derelict in duty in rushing through not merely a 2- but a 4-year extension of the draft with no more discussion than the matter received in the House of Representatives.

Why 4 years? Is this not a condemnation in advance of any hopeful and vigorous effort to end or even to abate the cold war?

That war is the only argument that anyone can advance for the conscription of men in a democracy.

There was, I recall, a time when powerful voices were raised in praise of universal military training and service as somehow in themselves a blessing to the Nation and to its sons. (This in spite of the history of such conscription and its effects in Germany and Russia.)

I have heard it advocated as a way to deal with the growth in crime, especially juvenile delinquency. The Selective Service Act, to be sure, falls short of universal military training and service. It was, however, welcomed by some of the advocates of the latter as the next best thing in its educational influence upon youth. I am not accusing selective service as a cause of juvenile delinquency when I say that the figures give absolutely no support to the notion that it is a preventive of it, or the school of a devoted and intelligent patriotism.

In brief, my contention is that there is no emergency making it necessary to compromise our American democracy by the conscription which gives to any man the powers of control of which General Hershey boasted. The case against the efficiency of selective service is strong. To a considerable degree it provides an escape for Congress, for the military, and the public from proper consideration of the establishment of an effective Military Establishment while we seek to end the cold war.

Above all, it imposes a costly burden on American youth, or the fittest of them. And they are the hope of our democracy.

While this statement is my own, and has not been passed upon by any committee of any political party, it expresses the general position of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation and is presented in its behalf as well as my own.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

I would like to add I am a veteran myself. I served 2 years in the United States, when I was eighteen and a half; I applied for an immediate induction so I could be drafted earlier instead of enlisting for 3 years.

I found an atmosphere when I was in the Army myself not at all conducive to being a professional because when men enlist they are in an atmosphere of men who have been drafted and these men are so hostile to the idea of serving against their will that they soon prevail among the bulk of people who have enlisted that is somehow ignoble to enlist in the United States. There are general terms of derision for men who have enlisted and make a career of it. They have these little slips or whatever you call them that each man is supposed to carry them.

The men who enlist are called an RA, a Regular Army man, and the fellow drafted is called the U.S. RA is used at least in the lower levels up through sergeant as a term of general derision. It is an insult to call somebody in the U.S. Army in the ranks up to corporal an RA. Maybe it is not nice but that is the way it is. As far as juvenile delinquency is concerned, when I entered basic training myself personally, I know of four men who I can think of just like that who enlisted in the U.S. Army solely because the judge said you either enlist in the U.S. Army or you will be sentenced to a term in the workhouse or in some sort of a training program as a juvenile delinquent.

Some judges think of it as such a place. These men did not add anything to the Army. One deserted later on, others had court marials and so forth. This is the general kind of atmosphere.

I saw very many fellows with enormous qualities and capabilities, graduate engineers, scholars, people who attempted to do creative work who were put in the Army for 2 years, perhaps the most productive years of their life.

Historians say that is the age up to 26 for original creative work.

Einstein published his theory on relativity, for example, at the age of 26. I think recent reports would indicate that there could be better utilization of manpower within the Army, even among these carefully nurtured people. It kind of disproves the idea that these people who create scientific work remain in the Army.

Chairman RUSSELL. Why did they look down upon the Regular Army man who is serving in the same organization with them, Mr. Bolitzer?

Did they think it was a sign of mental incapacity that a man would make the military his career?

Is that back of it?

Mr. BOLITZER. That was part of it. You see 90 percent of the people who enlist, 90 percent of the people in the Army, the younger men are drafted. They don't want to be in the Army. It is against their will and they see somebody else who normally speaking by the way is not exactly—these primarily are some of the most intellectual men in the Army, the college graduates, the high school graduates. They see somebody who has enlisted in the Army who normally does not have the educational background who quite often enlists to get away from unfavorable home conditions and they don't think perhaps that he is exactly the finest representative of American youth.

Chairman RUSSELL. He is certainly not an egghead.

Mr. BOLITZER. It is not being an egghead to get court-martialed right and left. The difference in court-martials rates between enlisted and draftees according to the figures I have seen are very interesting. Are there any other questions, sir?

Chairman RUSSELL. Do those young men have any idea how the country might be defended from any potential attacker without a Military Establishment?

Mr. BOLITZER. Most of the guys in the Army had no objection to serving in time of war at all.

Chairman RUSSELL. I believe O'Brien said in World War I that if the enemy came here there would be 3 million men here who would spring out from behind the plow and the shops and push them back.

Mr. BOLITZER. The inequality of the draft is such that many men feel they have not been as smart as the other fellow because the other fellow has managed to evade the draft completely.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you think they would have felt better about it if we had taken them all?

Mr. BOLITZER. Sure.

Chairman RUSSELL. They would have?

Mr. BOLITZER. Sure.

Chairman RUSSELL. On the idea that misery loves company?

Mr. BOLITZER. That is a truism, you know.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Case?

Senator CASE. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Mr. Bolitzer.

The next witness is Mr. David Whatley.

Come around, Mr. Whatley.

STATEMENT OF DAVID WHATLEY, BETHESDA, MD.

Mr. WHATLEY. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and your patience is not exhausted, I hope. I shall be very brief and I ask permission to extend my remarks in writing.

I will speak briefly and extemporaneously.

Chairman RUSSELL. You don't have a written statement, sir?

Mr. WHATLEY. I have not prepared it in writing thus far.

Chairman RUSSELL. I will let you go ahead this time, Mr. Whatley, but I think this is the second time.

Mr. WHATLEY. The notice from the committee did not indicate that the written statement was a prerequisite to appearing.

Chairman RUSSELL. I thought the rule is quite clear that witnesses are supposed to submit written statements. I don't know whether you were apprised of that or not.

Mr. WHATLEY. I wasn't apprised of that, that the statement must be submitted before the appearance.

Chairman RUSSELL. All right, sir.

We won't haggle over it at this time, but next time I hope you will go to the trouble of having some copies made.

Mr. WHATLEY. I shall follow that procedure hereafter, Mr. Chairman. As many members of the committee may know, I am not a pacifist and have supported certain phases of our military effort and insofar as is possible I have urged over the years increased preparedness of air power and certain other weapons; in 1950 when I opposed the extension of the draft before this able committee, during which my testimony was rather extensive and I shall not repeat it, the question then posed before the Congress was the adequacy of \$13 billion appropriation, and that year I was lobbying as a private citizen on behalf of increased air power. But in that year before the Korean war started, General Eisenhower appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee on behalf of the \$13 billion budget and General Bradley is reported in the press as having said anyone who advocated more than \$13 billion be spent on our Armed Forces ought to have his head examined. I suggest that the situation today as it was in the spring of 1950 is very similar, Mr. Chairman, and I question whether we need to spend the enormous sums on our Army and Navy and conventional forces that we are now spending. I suggest, sir, that after an adequate study by the Congress of manpower requirements, we could reduce the enormous expenditures and waste in the Army and Navy on manpower and equipment. In my humble opinion they

afford us very little protection, and the reductions achieved in that fashion might very well be utilized for very vital research such as that proposed recently in the field of oceanography or additional development of antimissile missiles. I think it is a recognized fact that many of our missile programs have lagged because the necessary sums were not available.

I suggest that over the years those sums may have been available except for the enormous waste of billions of dollars upon the conventional manpower needs. The draft simply perpetuates an illusion of protection but gives us no real protection either in the light of thermonuclear weapons, germ warfare for which there is absolutely no defense, and even in the light of the type of war in which we unfortunately engaged in Korea. Former Secretary Wilson said that in thinking over what had happened over the years in Korea, he could not see, no matter what amount of money had been spent on conventional forces that the situation would have been any different.

United States policies in Korea determined the outcome more than the number of troops.

Senator Jackson has suggested that we now mobilize several additional divisions to face the Russians over the Berlin crisis. I suggest that that is a very quixotic position to take in view of the fact that many military experts that you might call before this committee would state, in my opinion, that we could quadruple our ground forces in NATO and it still would be no match in a conventional war with Russia.

If the war is not conventional and thermonuclear weapons are used, I simply cannot see as a layman why a quadrupling of our forces in Western Europe would have any effect militarily. Therefore, I think it would have virtually no effect diplomatically. In the light of the pending Berlin situation and the possibility of a high-level Foreign Ministers Conference, and perhaps even the participation of our President in a subsequent conference, I suggest that the Congress owes to the American people a duty to defer any action on this draft at least for a month or two so that the excuse would not obtain that by failing to renew the draft we have weakened our diplomatic position.

I personally think it is ephemeral to think that it is a diplomatic position of strength. But assuming that it may be so interpreted by the Russians, I think the decision should be deferred for a couple of months, and at that time perhaps we could look at the situation more soberly and I would hope that the Congress this time might extend the draft for only 1 year.

Many advocates against the draft tell me they will not propose a 1-year extension as an alternative to a 2-year extension, because it would be unrealistic for the Congress to vote upon an extension of the draft in an election year.

I think Members of Congress have enough fortitude and courage to vote their conscientious convictions on this question, and I suggest that 1 year would be adequate for a full-scale study. I have suggested for many years in the past that a study of our total security requirements in the light of these weapons of mass destruction be undertaken by a joint security council composed of members of the executive branch, the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Subcommittee handling defense requirements and their counterparts in the House.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, and in addition your preparedness subcommittee ought to be given adequate funds to investigate the existing organization and operations of the Defense Department in the great detail in which the watchdog committees of the House, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Government Operations Committee have scrutinized the operations of the military assistance program. In that program they found enormous waste and I suggest that 10 times the waste could be found in our conventional Military Establishment.

You are using drafted men to mow the lawns in Arlington Cemetery to do many civilian things that could be done in those fields. These points have been covered very adequately in the statement by Mr. Celeste and I shall not belabor them.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I ask permission to include, since this is such an important issue constitutionally, the only article I have seen that definitively and extensively surveys the constitutionality of peacetime conscription.

This article has never been printed in any hearings I am certain. It is written by a distinguished professor of law, Dr. Harrop H. Freeman, published in the Virginia Law Review. Except for the final portion of it which relates to conscientious objectors, I ask permission to have it inserted in the record.

Chairman RUSSELL. Without objection the article will be included in the hearings. (See Appendix II.)

Mr. WHATLEY. On that point, Mr. Chairman, may I take 1 minute to ask you to consider this analogy. Should Congress amend the income tax statutes of our Government so that income taxes would be paid only by males of certain ages, and some males of those ages would not be required to pay taxes if they were married and had children or if they were in certain colleges engaged in certain studies, or if there was some little physical or mental impairment which the Government found made them imperfect physically and mentally? Only the few persons of that particular age and sex group of our population would then have to pay income taxes.

I ask you, sir, do you think under the due process of law of our Constitution and the due process of law practices the Supreme Court would ratify such an action if it were tested?

Chairman RUSSELL. Did you say you thought we ought to expand the missile program?

Mr. WHATLEY. I think there are many programs in research and development that ought to be expedited and can be expedited only with additional moneys that would be available under the system of balanced budget by reducing the appropriations on conventional forces, manpower in the Army and Navy which are not so essential.

I am very grateful for your time, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any further questions?

(The material referred to is included as Appendix II.)

Chairman RUSSELL. That concludes the testimony for today.

The committee will be in recess until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 1:40 p.m. the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, March 5, 1959.)

DRAFT EXTENSION

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1959

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 212, Senate Office Building.

Present: Senators Russell (presiding), Stennis, Bartlett, Saltonstall, Smith, Case, Bush, and Beall.

Also present: Harold Wool, Chief, Analysis Division, Office of Secretary of Defense, and Col. Randolph Dickens, Director, Reserve Affairs Policy Division.

Also present: Messrs. Darden, Wingate, Braswell, and Atkinson of the committee staff.

Chairman RUSSELL. Congressman Meyer, of Vermont, was scheduled to appear here yesterday. He was unable to be with us. We will allow him a few minutes this morning to make a statement with respect to his views on this bill and then to offer any statement he sees fit for the record. Is the Congressman present?

Mr. MEYER. Right here, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Have a seat, Congressman.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am appearing in opposition to the bill. This is a statement that I have prepared. It is very brief, on extension of the draft. I very much appreciate being granted this opportunity to testify. I will refer you to my statement made before the House Armed Services Committee on January 29, 1959, and submit a copy of my extemporaneous remarks which I made at that time. I will also refer you to the prepared statement I made during the debate on the House floor on February 5, 1959. I also submit a copy of these remarks and suggest that the entire House debate presents materials of great value on this subject.

A steady stream of mail has come to my office from all over the country endorsing my position. This mail is still coming in and practically no letters oppose my stand. It is a humbling experience to read that on this issue these people think of me "as their representative."

When citizens in many States come to my office or speak to me when I appear on various matters on various platforms, it is a unique and undeserved experience to hear them say in effect that they "thank God that my voice has been raised to say what must be said."

It is my opinion that millions of Americans agree with my studied viewpoint and that millions more are uneasy and would agree if they knew more about the situation.

I urge you to delay passing legislation until every angle has been considered. There is plenty of time until the present act expires and I am certain that the facts justify terminating the draft or at the very least substituting a compromise in the form of an improved version.

I submit this prepared statement and copies of the material that I referred to.

Chairman RUSSELL. The matter will appear in the record following the statement that Congressman Meyer has just made.

(The document referred to follows:)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have not made a written statement. In fact, I did it purposely. I wanted to speak from an outline so that I could give you the facts as I see them coming from my heart and my mind and my experience and my study of this issue.

I assure you that I have given it considerable study over the years.

I feel I should give you a little bit about my personal background. At one time in my life I thought I would like to go to Annapolis. I have had some ROTC training and for a while I lived near Fort Dix and worked near Fort Dix. As I say, I have studied and read considerably about these things.

My family has fought in many of the wars of this country. One of my ancestors came here because he wanted to come to a land that did not have military conscription, peacetime military conscription.

Another relative of mine, Colonel D'Olier, was first national commander of the American Legion. And many of my friends have been officers in the Army and served in the ranks. I am well acquainted with many of the problems. Of course, there is to a slight extent a political case against peacetime military conscription, and in my personal campaign I raised the issue. I said that I didn't think that peacetime conscription was necessary nor good for the country.

I have had many letters as a result of the campaign that I waged and I think there is much feeling in the country that supports this position. And before going into the details of actually making a statement, I think that this problem can't be discussed properly without thinking of militarism itself.

Now, our country traditionally has honored our generals and our admirals, our Armed Forces, and looked up to them for technical leadership.

However, we have not generally looked up to them or asked of them leadership in national policy, in framing policy in foreign affairs, or in the affairs of government.

And I would like to say that if we want to look into history, we can find that in Rome the Praetorian Guard—I don't mean to say that we have a Praetorian Guard, but nevertheless that type of thing—led or helped to lead to the decline and fall of Rome. And I think we should not be unaware of this condition.

We should also be aware of the fact that in countries like Germany too much militarism was the thing that this country objected to, and all through history we have seen this pattern of having too much militarism.

And also we must remember that if the military becomes too entrenched, we could have too much bureaucracy and the military, itself, would not function as well as it would without it.

I have been somewhat alarmed by the entrance of high military officers into business, industry, education, research and colleges, not that that in itself is wrong. That is perfectly proper. But I don't think that it is right if they enter because of their relationship to the Armed Forces.

I think that presents a great threat to the future welfare of the country because eventually everything could be guided by the military type of thinking and that is not in accord with our traditions.

I have spoken with many friends who are generals, colonels, or in the lower ranks in the Army, and I feel that many of them join my opinion that the best defense of this country will not be secured by this peacetime draft. I don't think nearly so many, as most assume, agree with the recommendation for the continuance of the draft.

We have so much waste in training. I know of one Ohio boy I met on the train, and he spoke to me as though he had about 13 weeks of training, and then he went to doing bricklaying and that type of thing. I can't see any point to that in the defense of our country.

I know of another boy who went to college for training. He worked with me three summers, and I tried to help him in a technical sense. He was going in the Air Force as a pilot. I maintain that these things should be determined ahead of time. In connection with the draft, itself, I would like to point out that this is important, that we should try to determine the potential of the men that we are going to have serve us, particularly in this highly technological age.

I should like to point out also the matter of pay increases. As I understand the recent bill for increases, the privates received only \$3 more. Certainly that was no great incentive and is no measure of our ability to have volunteer enlistment by providing adequate pay scales.

And also the draft system does not give us the men of the caliber and spirit that we need for a really effective defense force. It also interferes with the training of many of our young men training as scientists, and we have to evaluate our strength not only in terms of an army but in terms of the whole Nation.

We need strength in other fields, and if we disturb the training of some men who are best qualified to become scientists or something else, we are not strengthening our country, but we are weakening it.

I can only refer to the Cordier report. I am sure you have all read it. I know there are many points in there that we should think about.

In the cost of training one of these draftees, as I understand it, for a 2-year period it amounts to \$11,000. Financially that is not good for our country, when these men are being—well, they are going out on their own accord and not staying in as career professionals.

I tried to get a statement on the cost of the induction system, itself, the Selective Service System. As I understand it, it is \$195.17 for 1956 per man—per inductee. In 1957, \$159.45. And in 1958, \$208.69.

I don't believe that this represents all the cost myself. However, if this amount of money was used to raise the pay scale of the career man, I think it would go a long way to helping us have the type of defense force that we should have.

Now I would go on and present a little bit of the moral case. We want peace, or at least I hope we do. And we know that a government such as Hitler's in its orientation was not the type that would work toward peace.

I feel that we are more or less at a turning point in history. We have to determine whether this country of ours is going to follow the pattern that is so tragically common now in Europe and has been in the past, the pattern which—while I don't mean to speak this strongly—but resembles Hitlerism, or whether we are going to continue the traditions of our country and not go down this dangerous road of permanent militarism.

I also would like to point out as a moral point the inequities of this system of drafting.

In general, poor boys who don't have the money to go to college and would have to go out and work and then save and then go—they can't be exempted from the draft, and yet the ones who have the money to go can go. Therefore, if they do good work, they are more or less automatically exempted. And this type of thing goes through in many cases.

And I should like to mention that what appears right at the moment is not always right.

In the Civil War, the men from the North were drafted and yet if they had \$300, to get someone to serve for them, they could more or less purchase an exemption. I say that when history looks back upon this period of time that we are going through now, it will judge us, that we have been inequitable and unfair, and that the system has not been democratic.

And I say also that this in our present economy is a way of getting cheap labor through drafting. If we want men, let us get good men, and let us pay them the current wage for service to their country as they deserve.

I think this is one of the most important points. And I believe that by reducing the number of men, getting better qualified men, that we definitely can afford to pay them these wages, which will promote voluntary enlistment, and that in the end we will be stronger and better off.

And I need not mention too much about the religious aspects of this.

There are many people whose religion makes them feel that military service is not an ideal goal, and many of them who, where their religion and religious

belief does not necessarily make them exempt or conscientious objectors, nevertheless, are not enthused about this service.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the way to peace can't be found if we try to inculcate in all our youth too much of the military mind or too much of military thinking. And I say all of this not in any disrespect to our officers and to the men of our services. I respect them most highly. I say this as a citizen interested in the future welfare of my country.

WHY I OPPOSE THE DRAFT, FEBRUARY 5, 1959

The continuance of military conscription at this time is neither necessary nor desirable.

I have studied this issue thoroughly, and years of study and reflection have added to my conviction. As a result of my speaking publicly against this measure, I received letters from many people scattered across this land. Almost all of them urge me to speak for them in this House, and I believe that they represent the thinking of millions of Americans.

I have, in a few weeks, learned to love this citadel of liberty, but even more I love my country and its cherished traditions. I respect the leaders of this body and sincerely believe that my colleagues advocate what they consider right and proper.

My love for my country and my convictions as to its best interests force me to differ with some of them on this issue. I know that they will respect my right to speak the truth as I see it, with all the force and directness available to me, just as I will respect their rights.

I wish that I did not have to conclude that a cancerous militarism is growing in this country. It poses a threat to most of our institutions and creates an unevaluated inner peril. If this House continues to permit military leaders and their spokesmen to usurp the powers and duties of Congress, then Patrick Henry spoke in vain. All of us honor the officers and men who lead or maintain our defenses, but we should not permit them to unduly interfere in the formation of national policy or legislation.

Washington recognized the danger, and Jefferson advocated a free civilian government. If we allow a modern Praetorian Guard to incubate as a menace to a modern Rome, we will have chosen Sparta at its worst in preference to Athens at its best. Must we imitate Germany because Russia has become a neighbor and competitor? Must we burn our house because we hear a wolf howl at our door?

The answer is a ringing, everlasting NO.

This great land of ours can find a positive way to peace. We can maintain an adequate military defense without crucifying our traditions and ideals on a double-edged sword. Make no mistake, the military state is such a sword. It may protect us from invasion, but it can lead to self-destruction or to dangerous adventuring.

We have the moral force and the spiritual resources to forge an international system of law and order. We have the people and the economic strength to lead the world to justice and understanding. The way to positive solutions may be difficult, but who wants the easy path that leads to nowhere?

I have no time or use for appeasement, but as long as I have access to this floor, I will fight for reason and for truth. I will not admit that the spirit of the men who followed William Penn to these shores is dead.

Why should we speed this bill to the Senate?

I appeal to your sense of responsibility. We are no rubber stamp. Why should we relegate debate to the Senate?

If this is "the most important bill" coming before the Armed Services Committee, then I say that this House should combine duty and pride so as to be of service to the public in thoroughly evaluating it. What is the reason for rushing it through?

Why were we not furnished the record of the hearings in time to weigh the pros and cons? Why should this House and the American people not be granted adequate time to consider and deliberate?

Are we children (for whom father knows best)? The generals have spoken—let the American people have a chance to raise their voices, too. Perhaps I am living in a never, never land in which the voiceless masses of free Americans defer to a few admirals. I doubt it. I hope that I am not, because I do not know how such a country could be defended.

Here are 10 of the many reasons for not extending the draft:

1. We can have better defense with volunteer, career professional forces. The need is for quality rather than quantity.
2. Well-paid forces provide better defense at less expense under such conditions.
3. We have no right to conscript labor at substandard rates nor to maintain a system riddled with inequities.
4. The Pentagon itself knows that the system is wrong.
5. The Pentagon and others push this bill only because they are afraid to try to change it. They will not make the effort unless forced to do so, and they fear discussion, because they know that the entire issue is explosive and riddled with legitimate grounds for objections.
6. It interferes with the proper development of our youthful manpower.
7. It weakens the total strength of our country which must include science, industry, agriculture, and other fields as well as the military.
8. It is wasteful in every way.
9. It lulls us into a false sense of security and hinders the mobilizing of moral and spiritual forces while inculcating militaristic doctrine.
10. It violates our traditions and conflicts with much of our moral and religious thinking. This does not contribute to our international standing or to peaceful solutions of world problems.

A full case against conscription cannot be developed in a few minutes when the issue merits many hours of study. However, I can alert you to the dangers of passing such a bill—particularly under forced pressure. This calls dramatic attention to the even greater dangers in militarism that threaten our way of life.

This is much more than the voting on an Army draft bill. American democracy is on trial. It may be later than we think in the cycles of history. I hope that this is not so, but shadows of handwriting appear upon the wall. This means that we may face in militarism an inner danger almost as great as the external dangers. We might destroy ourselves while trying to protect ourselves.

In closing, I would like to call your attention to words from the Constitution of Vermont which call for "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles" in order to "preserve the blessing of liberty and keep government free."

This I urge you to consider.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you have any questions, Senator Saltonstall?

Senator SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. MEYER. I have another thing that is not in my statement. It is very brief. I question the ethics of presenting hearsay evidence but could make one more remark bearing on the theme of my published argument. Naturally I will not make it if such a statement is improper or I will make it off the record if you so desire, but it is only hearsay.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any statement that you make on your responsibility as a Member of Congress we will receive, Congressman Meyer. I don't know what the statement is. If you wish to submit it for the committee to consider it in executive session we will be glad to have you do that, but you are a Member of the Congress of the United States as the members of this committee are.

Mr. MEYER. I feel personally that I should not submit here hearsay evidence even though it has a direct bearing on the matter.

Chairman RUSSELL. Very well, sir. That is very unusual, of course hearsay evidence is not relied on very heavily, but I must say we get quite a bit of that from time to time. We are glad to have you here, Congressman.

Mr. MEYER. Thank you, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. On yesterday and the day before we had rather extensive testimony from nongovernmental witnesses. Today the

committee is ready to hear from the representatives of the Department of Defense and of the Selective Service System.

The Honorable Charles C. Finucane, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve), the Honorable Frank B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical), and Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service System, are present to give the views of the executive branch on the pending bill.

The witnesses are well known to the members of the committee. Secretary Finucane, I understand that you are to testify on the extension of the act, extending the authority to induct and the extension of the Dependents' Assistance Act, and the continued suspension of personnel ceilings. We are glad to have you here and you may proceed with any statement you see fit to make.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES C. FINUCANE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER, PERSONNEL, AND RESERVE)

MR. FINUCANE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Secretary of Defense considers H.R. 2260 vital to the security of our Nation, and before starting my testimony, sir, may I ask that Secretary McElroy's complete statement be filed for the record.

Chairman RUSSELL. We will be glad to receive the Secretary's statement, and it will follow the testimony of Assistant Secretary Finucane.

MR. FINUCANE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Charles C. Finucane, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve. I welcome the opportunity to appear before you in support of H.R. 2260.

H.R. 2260, if enacted into law, will extend until July 1, 1963, the authority to induct persons under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. It will also extend the suspension of the limitations on Armed Forces strengths to July 1, 1963, and it will extend the provisions of the Dependents' Assistance Act for the same period.

EXTENSION OF INDUCTION AUTHORITY

I firmly believe that continuation of the authority to induct men into the Armed Forces is absolutely essential to the maintenance of our active and reserve military strength goals.

The Secretaries of each of the Military Departments and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are of the same conviction.

The present general induction authority was originally provided by the Selective Service Act of 1948, after it was demonstrated that authorized strengths could not be attained by voluntary methods alone.

This authority, which has been continuously in existence since that time, will, except for certain persons previously deferred, expire on July 1, 1959. We strongly urge its further extension until July 1, 1963, as provided in section 1 of H.R. 2260.

CONTINUING NEED FOR INDUCTEES

It has been the firm objective of all services to obtain all military manpower through voluntary means, and thus obviate the need for the draft.

During the past several years strenuous efforts have been made to increase the attractiveness of military service, and thereby improve our voluntary enlistment and reenlistment rates.

The Congress has been extremely cooperative in these efforts by providing legislation covering such items as increased pay and various allowances, improved survivor benefits, and improved dependents' medical care benefits. Also, various administrative measures have been taken to make military service more appealing, including increased stabilization of assignments and additional training and educational opportunities.

The results are gratifying. A greater proportion of our requirements for new enlisted personnel are being met by volunteers. Also, first-term reenlistment rates are up in all services. For the Department of Defense as a whole, these rates have increased from 25 percent in fiscal year 1957 to 32 percent for the first 5 months of fiscal year 1959.

Despite the encouraging gains toward our ultimate objective, inductions are still needed to meet total authorized strengths. During fiscal year 1958, it was necessary to induct a total of 126,000 men into the Army. This amounted to about half of the Army intake, and 24 percent of the total Department of Defense intake of enlisted personnel from civil life.

During the current fiscal year, we estimate that the Army will induct 115,000 men. It is expected that we shall have to induct an average of about 90,000 men annually for the period fiscal year 1960 through fiscal year 1963.

Universal Military Training and Service Act stimulates voluntary enlistments and officer procurement. The Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, although not presently inducting men, benefit to a considerable extent from the stimulus of the draft in their voluntary procurement programs. Many young men who enlist voluntarily in these services do so in lieu of being inducted. In that way they are able to select the service of their choice and serve at a time and in a manner most convenient to them. Since these enlistments are in most instances for 3, 4, or more years—rather than 2 years—they have substantial advantages in reduced turnover, reduced training loads, and increased effective use of manpower.

In addition to stimulating enlistments, the Universal Military Training and Service Act assists in the procurement of officer personnel.

The majority of our new junior officers are obtained through college-oriented programs such as the ROTC. There is no doubt that many men enter these programs in preference to being inducted as enlisted men.

A reduction in applicants could jeopardize our ability to meet our requirements and would provide less opportunity for selection of the better-qualified candidates.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT ESSENTIAL TO RESERVE FORCES

Continuation of the induction authority is also essential to the maintenance of adequate Reserve forces. Programs for direct en-

listment into the Ready Reserve provide important sources of new reserve manpower and provide attractive alternative means for discharging the military service obligation.

For example, the Navy's Reserve enlistment program requires 2 years of active duty. Undoubtedly many men select this program in lieu of being inducted for the same period of service.

The Army likewise uses the 2-year active-duty Reserve enlistment program. It also features programs under which enlistees take 6 months of active duty for training and subsequently participate in the Reserve as a condition for deferment from induction. In addition to motivating men to enlist in these programs, the draft authority assures their continued reserve participation. In fiscal year 1958 the Army Reserve, including the National Guard, enlisted over 80,000 men into its 6 months' programs.

Loss of the induction authority would sharply decrease the attractiveness of these programs to the point where the requirement for 6 months of active duty for training would probably have to be removed in order to obtain a sufficient number of enlistees.

While recruiting goals might be met under these revised conditions, the readiness goals required by modern concepts could not be attained. In this connection, we certainly hope the committee will take favorable action on the bill to extend the 6 months' Reserve program which will shortly be before you.

The Marine Corps depends on the same types of direct Reserve enlistment programs used by the Army and would be subject to the same adverse effects if the draft ceased to exist. The Air Force Reserve, including the Air National Guard, also has direct Reserve enlistment programs which benefit appreciably by the stimulus of the draft.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT NEEDED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Continuing authority to make special calls for physicians and dentists is necessary to meet requirements for such personnel. Draft-inspired volunteers have been our principal source of medical and dental officers during the past several years.

By June 30, 1959, about 50 percent of all physicians serving on active duty, and about 60 percent of the dentists will be noncareer officers.

Practically all of these will have accepted Reserve commissions with the obligation of 2 years' active duty in lieu of being inducted under special selective service calls. Dr. Berry, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical), will speak in more detail on this matter.

NEED FOR A 4-YEAR EXTENSION

Mr. Chairman, we realize that a number of questions have been raised recently in connection with the extension of the induction authority. One of these concerns the period of time for which the authority should be extended.

We firmly believe that there are compelling reasons for a 4-year extension. The draft was extended for 4 years in 1951 and again in 1955.

We do not see anything in the world picture to indicate that the basic reasons for the draft will change over the next 4 years, or that we can afford to relax our military posture.

Extension for another 4 years would provide firm assurance to our friends, as well as any potential enemies, that we are determined to maintain our Armed Forces at levels necessary to deter aggression. In our considered opinion, extension for a lesser period would tend to be interpreted abroad as a slackening in effort, and possibly a softening in attitude toward our worldwide commitments.

Equally important, extension for a lesser period would tend to create false impressions in the minds of our young men regarding their future military responsibilities. It could cause many of them to make unsound career plans which assume an early end to the draft.

Since we foresee an actual need for the draft for the next 4 years, I believe we should in good conscience make that clear to our young people now.

That would be only fair to the large numbers of young men who, knowing that there will be a continuing military obligation, will prefer to discharge it at an early age.

MILITARY SERVICE OUTLOOK

In this connection, there has been a certain amount of public misunderstanding as to the military service outlook for draft age young men. There has been an impression that only a very small proportion of the young men of military age—perhaps 1 out of 10—are required for military service.

The actual facts are quite different. These facts have been developed in a recent study by the Department of Defense, in cooperation with selective service, the Labor Department, and other interested Government agencies.

First, we found that 7 out of every 10 men now reaching age 26 have actually seen service or are now serving. Moreover, if we exclude those who did not meet minimum standards, fully 9 out of 10 qualified men have served. The remainder consists almost entirely of men in deferred categories.

Looking ahead to 1963, we estimate that—despite a gradual growth of the manpower pool—about 55 percent of all 26-year-old men, and nearly 8 out of 10 qualified men, will have entered military service. The remainder again will consist of fathers or of others in deferred status.

The study clearly establishes that virtually no nonfathers, qualified and available for service under the law, are currently escaping their service obligation or are likely to escape their obligation through 1963.

MAXIMUM AGE OF LIABILITY

A proposal has sometimes been advanced to reduce the maximum age of liability for induction from 25 to some earlier age. This has been put forward in the belief that it would ease career planning of the individual by relieving the so-called uncertainty of the draft.

In our judgment, there are substantial advantages in the present age span of liability. This offers greater flexibility to the individual in the timing of military training according to his own educational and other career plans.

Many young men prefer to fulfill the military obligation at a later age because they desire to complete college—or to establish an assured civilian job status—before entering service.

On the other hand, many other individuals prefer to fulfill the military obligation at an early age so that their careers will not be interrupted later.

This they can do by volunteering for the various Reserve training programs, volunteering for induction, or enlisting in the service of their choice.

The important point is that the individual can choose when to serve within the present age span in terms of his own career plans. With the wide range of opportunities for fulfilling the military obligation, there should be no reason for a registrant to have difficulty in planning his career.

Our statistics show that the great majority of men entering the Armed Forces prefer to take the initiative and discharge their obligation at an early age. The median age of the 352,000 nonprior service personnel who voluntarily entered on active duty in the Armed Forces in fiscal year 1958, including 40,000 voluntary inductees, was 19 years. In contrast, the median age of the 86,000 involuntary inductees was slightly less than 23 years.

There is one additional point I believe will be of interest to the committee. Reducing the maximum age of liability could have a damaging effect on student deferments. Local boards would undoubtedly be reluctant to defer college and graduate students until completion of their education if, by such deferment, the individuals would eventually avoid induction.

The student deferment program, continuously in effect since 1951, has been of great value in increasing the Nation's resources of highly trained manpower, including scientists, engineers, and other professional personnel. We do not believe that any step should be taken which would tend to lessen its effectiveness.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

I would now like to speak in support of section 2 of H.R. 2260 which provides for the continued suspension of statutory strength ceilings on the active forces.

Our current and programed Armed Forces strengths exceed basic legislative limitations, and have done so since 1951. Recognizing that it would be impossible for the Armed Forces to meet their commitments if they were compelled to adhere to the statutory strength limitations, the Congress has in the past provided for suspension of those ceilings.

We strongly urge their further suspension until July 1, 1963.

Unless the suspension is continued, a reduction in total strength of approximately half a million or about 20 percent would be required. This would result in the demobilization of large segments of our active combat and supporting elements, and would clearly be highly dangerous to national and free world security in these troublesome times.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I interrupt, Mr. Chairman, for a clarifying point?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. You are speaking, Mr. Finucane, when you say "to exceed the basic legislative limitations," you are speaking for all three services and not just the Army?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir, I am speaking for all services. We have presently 2½ million men on duty and our limitation is about 2 million.

Gentlemen, my final remarks are addressed in support of the extension of the Dependents' Assistance Act as provided by section 3 of H.R. 2260. The act provides additional allowances to enlisted members of the armed services with dependents, and provides a means of making funds available to such dependents for their living expenses on a regular basis. The allowances under this act have been given since 1950. Termination of this legislation would impose undue financial hardship. The extension of the act is therefore strongly recommended.

I have attempted in my brief statement to show that I consider this legislation vital to our national security. It will give us the ability to maintain our Armed Forces at strength levels necessary to meet our military commitments and deter aggression.

That is the end of my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Finucane, we have had considerable testimony here to the effect that a great deal of military personnel are doing work that should be done by civilian employees. Has the Department of Defense conducted any studies as to the utilization of manpower that would give us any indication as to the correctness of these assertions?

Mr. FINUCANE. We have indeed, Senator Russell. It was one of the primary recommendations of the Hoover Commission that as far as possible we use civilians in all the civilian-type positions that we had, and particularly in the logistical and backup services. We have over the years in the Air Force moved about 36,000 civilians into positions previously held by the military. We have in the Army the Operation Teammate, which was completed, and we in that operation transferred about 9,800. Now I would say ideally, sir, we have gone almost as far as we think we should go. We must keep our military men trained. We must give them rotation possibilities and we must keep a firm nucleus of know-how within the uniformed branch, and it is our considered opinion, Mr. Chairman, that we have made good progress. We are going to continue to work on this program.

We have a defense directive ordering it indeed, but we feel that we have come about as far as we should go.

Chairman RUSSELL. I assume from what you say that you are continuing these studies.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes.

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes, to adapt the military status to the change in weapons systems and other dramatic transformations in our defense methods.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, Senator Russell. We have some related information. We have raised substantially—from 55 to 62 percent—our combat forces percentage of total strength over the years. Indeed, all three services have made substantial progress in using more civilians and less military.

Chairman RUSSELL. I believe you stated that if the ceilings were not extended, that we would be compelled on July 1 to reduce the military strength by 500,000.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. For the record I wish you would either state or have placed in the record the distribution of those numbers by services, please.

Mr. FINUCANE. I would be glad to state them for you, Senator Russell. The 2 million figure was determined by adding the statutory limits of 837,000 for the Army, 502,000 for the Air Force, and approximately 550,000 officers and enlisted personnel for the Navy, and the programmed strength for the Marine Corps of 175,000.

Chairman RUSSELL. The Air Force then would bear the brunt of the reduction.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. At a time when we are depending rather heavily upon the Air Force?

Mr. FINUCANE. If my memory serves me correctly, the Air Force is heading for 845,000, sir, and their limitation is 502,000.

Chairman RUSSELL. Have you undertaken to arrive at any estimated figures as to the effect on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces if Congress does not continue the authority to induct?

Mr. FINUCANE. The latest studies of the Army indicate that by using every method at their command, they could only get in the Army 580,000. I might say that this figure is higher than past studies due to the many fine inducements provided by Congress to keep people in, but you see, Senator Russell, it is still 300,000 less than our desired levels. The number of people that are in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps due to the pressure of the draft is indeterminate, something that we cannot exactly count. But we are confident that the stimulus of the draft has greatly aided their recruitment programs.

Chairman RUSSELL. In your statement as to the importance of continuing the draft for 4 years rather than 2, you brought up some of the elements that I thought were rather important, that make it desirable to continue it for 4 years rather than 2, primarily to clear up any confusion in the mind of the young man who might think that that indicated he was going to escape military service. As it is now they all plan their career based on the fact that at some stage they will have to render this service. Have you had any ideas as to the effect it might have on the operations of the draft itself if we were to extend only for 2 years. Do you think it would increase the number that would have to be called because the young men would go on the theory that they might not be the ones who would be called up and would not volunteer?

Mr. FINUCANE. Senator, there is no question that there would be more gambling on the part of young men that the Congress might not extend the draft after the shorter period, and certainly that would have its effect on voluntary enlistments.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, I have been somewhat concerned about the disparity of service of those who are in the Reserve program or who have a Reserve obligation, both the obligation that comes after 2 years of service or after 6 months of training. It seems to be rather dependent on the proximity of some Reserve unit than any other one thing. What effect do you think it would have if you made the Reserve training, the Reserve service, voluntary, and opened up the 6 months' training to its full potentials. As it is now you are not

training all the young men who want to be trained for 6 months. That would eliminate the element of compulsion on the few who might not wish to go into the Reserve program.

Mr. FINUCANE. Senator Russell, I have prepared a few remarks on this subject as it is quite involved and very important, I believe at the moment. Would it be agreeable to yourself and your committee if I read those?

Chairman RUSSELL. I want to get some information about it because the Department of Defense has changed its attitude on the Reserve program from time to time and we had the Department up here in 1955 and it had an objective of a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000, in order to keep 1,700,000 on drill pay status.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. At that time they indicated if we did not expand the Reserve program it would be necessary to increase the active duty forces all over the Nation. Today, of course, the strength of the Department in drill pay reservists is about 900,000. In the meantime the active-duty strength has gone down instead of gone up, as was threatened in 1955. I would be glad to have a statement on this because I don't think the present system is altogether fair. There are many men who want to enter the 6-month training program and participate in the Reserve. At the same time, some of the relatively few who are inducted are required to participate actively in the Reserve against their will.

Mr. FINUCANE. Before I make this statement answering the exact question, I might comment sir, on some of your previous statements. They are absolutely correct. We have about 2,400,000 people in the Ready Reserve not on active duty and we have about the number that you have stated on pay status. Now, we have studied those figures as long as 3 years ago and they decided at that time, after a study, that about a million men in pay status in the Reserve would do at that time, and the administration has kept to that figure since, with the exception of the 10-percent reduction in the Army Guard and the Army Reserve, of which we are well aware.

We do need our Reserve and we do rely on them very strongly, Senator Russell, and we would not want anything to interfere with their strength and their training, and we believe at the moment that due to the Reserve Act of 1955, that we have never had our Reserve forces as ready to go, as well trained as they are. We have nobody actually left in the Reserves who has not had 6 months' active duty training—practically nobody.

Chairman RUSSELL. I don't believe there is any question about that.

Mr. FINUCANE. They are all qualified to move overseas if necessary.

Chairman RUSSELL. They are more ready than they have ever been in our history.

Mr. FINUCANE. That's right.

Chairman RUSSELL. That applies to the National Guard, too.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Is the limitation that you have just stated of—a million men, I think it was—is that because there aren't the physical resources to keep more than that number, or is it because the

Army believes that that is as many as it can use if there is a sudden emergency and that would require further training?

Mr. FINUCANE. I believe, Senator Saltonstall, that it is not a matter of facilities. I think that we could train more people if the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense and the other authorities decided that the balance of forces required more. I think the reason that we have the size we have is that that is the figure that has been arrived at in the balance of forces required to keep the Nation strong, Senator.

I believe that that is it. I am perfectly satisfied that if we wanted to we could train many more people.

Chairman RUSSELL. As a matter of fact, you have got a long waiting list, haven't you, Mr. Secretary, of men who want to be trained?

Mr. FINUCANE. In the 6 months program?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, Senator; that is correct. I have been told that.

I would like to make a statement on the requirement for the 2-year veteran to serve in the Reserve. The Ready Reserve participation requirement is, of course, not a part of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which is presently under consideration. It was originally embodied in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, and it is now included in section 270 of title 10 U.S.C. Since the Army alone requires participation in the Ready Reserves of inductees, the proposal would directly affect only the Army Reserve and to a lesser degree the Army National Guard. In this respect it is important to note the disposition of the 104,000 obligors who were released from active duty through fiscal year 1958. Obligor include inductees and the small number of those reservists who enlisted for 6 years, with the requirement of 2 years of active duty who were subject to the participation requirements imposed by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. The distribution of these 104,000 men is as follows: 10,232 enlisted in the Army National Guard; 42,500 were assigned to Army Reserve units.

Chairman RUSSELL. Are you talking of the 2-year inductees in the Army?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Men who have already done 2 years?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir. This was for 1958.

Forty-three thousand five hundred remained in the reenforcement pool, Senator. That is the group of men that you mentioned that were not readily assignable, that were geographically or for other reasons are not able to be in a unit. And 7,768 were assigned to the Standby Reserve, enlisted in the Reserve components of the other services or were discharged. Now this distribution of the obligors resulted from the application of procedures which afford the individual very wide latitude. During the first 60 days after his release from active duty, he may apply for enlistment in the National Guard. During the next 30 days he may volunteer to affiliate with an Army Reserve unit with openings for his qualifications and his skills. If he has not affiliated with either the National Guard or the Army Reserve unit within 90 days, action is then taken by the Army to determine his Ready Reserve assignment. His qualifications are first matched against the vacancies in units relatively close to his home. In this process special consideration is given to factors such as his employment, his health, his family, and the many other things which might

mitigate against a unit assignment. If no unit vacancy exists for his qualifications, he is retained in a control group of the reenforcement pool. Mandatory assignment is based solely on the military requirements for the individual's skill. Those men assigned to units are required to participate in weekly drills and in 2 weeks' annual training for a 2-year period. Those in the reenforcement pool are required to participate in active duty for training some time during their 3-year obligated period.

Chairman RUSSELL. You say some time. Is it 15 days?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. They can discharge that over a 3-year period.

Mr. FINUCANE. I believe that is correct; yes.

The following distribution of all enlisted members of units of the Army Reserve as of December 1958 will furnish additional perspective on the need for the 2-year obligor in these units. Six months' trainees comprise 43 percent. The 2-year obligors comprise 25 percent, veterans with no obligation 23 percent, and non-prior-service men are now down to 9 percent and so will disappear.

From this distribution it can be readily seen that the 6-month trainee is numerically the single most important source of our Reserve unit manpower. Reliance for maintaining the necessary degree of mobilization readiness, deployment availability, and combat potential cannot be placed on this source of manpower alone in our opinion.

The 6-month trainee has acquired the basic military skills which qualify him to participate as a member of the unit. This training provides a sound basis for his integration into the unit team where his ability and his skill can be developed through more advanced training during his period of obligated service.

However, the composition of the Army's Ready Reserve units includes many skills and many specialties which require far more than 6 months of active duty training for the individual to acquire and attain a satisfactory degree of proficiency. The experience and the military skill of the 2-year active duty veteran is the binding agent which gives the unit coherence, strength, maturity, and a sense of purpose. In addition these finely trained men represent the future combat leadership and the future noncommissioned officer and junior officer material in the event of large expansion. They will, in fact, become increasingly important as the number of nonobligated World War II veterans, who are presently participating, decreases. We are firmly convinced that the removal of the requirement of the veteran to participate would seriously impair the ability of the Ready Reserve of the Army including to some degree the National Guard to carry out its mission in an emergency. Replacement with 6 months' trainees would greatly increase our personnel cost. Additionally, it would require more trainers, some more training facilities, and other logistical support. In substance, sir, I personally feel very strongly that the most valuable man we have available for the protection of our country other than the man on active duty, is the man who has completed a tour of duty in the service. That is true for the first 2 years after he has left service. We made studies years ago which indicated that the man who has just left the Army in the first 12 months maintains 90 percent of his top efficiency.

In the second 12 months he drops to 80 percent and in the third year he goes down to 20 percent since he has been away so long that he is out of touch.

So I have always considered the most valuable manpower pool that we have in the event of an emergency consists of the men who have been released from the armed services after 24 or 36 months of service, and for that reason, sir, we would like to maintain the status quo in that regard.

Chairman RUSSELL. I can understand why you want to maintain the status quo. Of course, that is inherent in any military organization. They want to keep men with the longest training, and this committee has sought to offer every inducement that we possibly could to enable you to maintain the people who had the skills to handle the implements of modern warfare. But you are still in the position of compelling Active Reserve participation by a great many men who have served 2 years—I say a great many. I don't really think it would be a large number, because we have made the Reserve service so attractive that the men who have a Reserve unit available to them, I think that many of them would go in voluntarily. If you think they do not attach great importance to the benefits that we have established for those who pursue their Reserve training, you ought to read some of the letters we get when the Department moves the Reserve units around in the field.

It disturbs the people who think they are going to lose their years of participation before qualifying for their retirement. But have you made any study to indicate what number of these men would go into these units voluntarily?

Mr. FINUCANE. I can't say that we have, Senator Russell. It would be a very difficult thing to ascertain, because under the present law they know they are obligated and you would have to determine what goes on in a man's mind if the rules of the game were changed, and I am afraid that our department has no substantial or effective figures on it.

Chairman RUSSELL. I can understand why it should attach to the man with 6 months' service. He goes in voluntarily knowing that in exchange for his staying on active duty for only 6 months, he has a definite Reserve obligation.

But there is a small number of men who are inducted against their will, we will say, for 2 years and who do the 2 years and then are compelled to stay on active duty, Active Reserve duty, for a period of years.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. Whereas a number of their companions who perhaps offered themselves up for 2 years of active duty under the Selective Service Act, when they complete their 2 years they want to get into a Reserve unit and can't because there is not one available.

I am a great exponent, it is almost passion with me, of equalizing the military obligation of the young men of this country as far as it is humanly possible to do.

This is one of the reasons that I vigorously supported universal military training many years ago. I supported it vigorously on two or three occasions and the Senate passed it after it was approved by this committee.

I concede today it is not as applicable as it has been in times past. But I am going to continue to try to find some way to take care of

the injustice that is done in small groups of men who are inducted and who serve 2 years, who are then against their will assigned to a Reserve organization. I don't believe there are many of them. I think most of them want to go on and get their drill pay and to get their entitlement for the retirement benefits after they have served the necessary period of time. But there is a group there that is being compelled to bear a little more than their fair share of the load as compared with the 6-month man, and a great deal more than the fellow who escapes service altogether.

I want to say in passing I am glad you pointed out that that number is not nearly so large as the public generally has thought. I think that those statistics that you offer are very valuable. I hope that they get wider circulation so that the people of the country know that there is not a large number of fully qualified young men who are escaping any service whatever.

Of course, we have raised the qualifications so high at the insistence of the Department of Defense that it is getting to the point where a person almost has to have a Phi Beta Kappa key in order to be eligible for the draft.

Have you any estimate of the number of men that wish to participate in the 6 months active training for the Reserve service and who are unable to do so under present policies?

Mr. FINCUANE. No; I haven't any figures, Senator, and I regret to say that I hear different statements from time to time.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have had some testimony in that field and that is the reason I asked you the question.

Mr. FINUCANE. The National Guard said they have very many people waiting in line to join, and yet I was advised by the Department the other day that if we did not raise the ceilings immediately, that they would not be able to get enough 6 months' inductees in the last 3 months. So that you can hear different stories, depending on what the point is to be proven. Would anybody like to add to that?

Colonel DICKENS. We do not know, Senator, how many are waiting in line.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is an honest and frank answer. I congratulate you. It is very seldom that we get any kind of an answer from representatives of the Department of Defense, like that. Sometimes they lose us in a maze of words in attempting to impress us that they do know something when they don't and I thank you for that answer.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I recognize this bill does not increase the payments under the Dependents' Assistance Act but for the record can you give use the total of these payments in a typical year under current conditions?

Mr. FINUCANE. I can give it by the individual, Senator Russell, and I will get for the record the total sum. I think it might be of interest to the committee as to the actual payments that we do make, and I would like to read them to you, sir. Enlisted men in the Armed Forces receive allowances because of their dependents. Each man contributes \$40 in the grades E-1, E-2, and E-3, \$60 in the grades E-4, and E-5 and \$80 in the grades E-6, 7, 8 and 9 from their own pay.

On that basis they obtain from the Government in the nature of a quarter's allowance, sums ranging from \$51.30 for the enlisted man

with one dependent to \$77.10 for two dependents and \$96.90 for an enlisted man with three dependents.

If the act is therefore not extended, considerable financial hardship would result to a large number of our enlisted people and their families.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, if you will excuse me, I think that we understand the amount of the individual payments to which they are entitled. I asked if you had any total of the payments in a typical year, the total amount that is paid under this Dependents' Assistance Act.

Mr. FINUCANE. We have about 980,000 men that are availing themselves of this privilege, sir. The exact numbers of dollars I don't have at hand.

Chairman RUSSELL. Of course, a varying amount is applied. Some men get twice as much as others do, due to the size of their family and other things.

Mr. FINUCANE. \$154 million in fiscal 1960.

Chairman RUSSELL. It doesn't cost as much as I thought.

Mr. FINUCANE. I am told it is \$954 million, Senator Russell, but I would certainly like to have that verified.

Chairman RUSSELL. I thought the other figure was exceedingly low.

(The following information was subsequently furnished:)

The Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1960 contains provision of approximately \$948 million under basic allowance for quarters for enlisted personnel. The sum is based on the Dependents Assistance Act rates. If that act were to expire, entitlement to basic allowance for quarters would revert to the rates specified in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. Under those rates, the total fiscal year 1960 enlisted personnel quarters allowance would be approximately \$514 million. Thus, the enlisted personnel affected would suffer a decrease in quarters allowance entitlement of approximately \$434 million.

Mr. Secretary, we have come across situations that seem to me worthy of the attention by the Department. It goes to the promotion system now being used by the Navy for its medical officers. It appears that the Navy is assessing the same criteria of attrition against the medical officers as they are their line officers when there is no hump in the medical service in the Navy, but you do have some medical officers who apparently are fully qualified who have rendered able service to the Navy, and who wish to stay in the Navy, but they are being passed over twice by the arbitrary application of this attrition as applied to your line officers.

This study indicates that 16 of the 22 doctors passed over were either certified by the board for promotion or were eligible for promotion. That means that these men had met the highest standards for American civilian medicine, including such specialties as surgery, internal medicine, urology, and others. The board for selection to commander passed over 34.48 percent of the lieutenant commanders in this zone. Even though there was a greater percentage passed over in the line the medical passovers were not based on any lack of qualification, but to arbitrarily assessed attrition.

I wish you would look into that if you are not familiar with it and see if there should not be some legislative revision of the Navy criteria in the field. It is entirely inconsistent with the doctors' draft to

have this washout of doctors who are completely qualified and are certified as being qualified.

We have had this problem of the hump in the Navy and in all the services for that matter. We have had it twice since I have been a member of this committee, once following World War I and even to a greater degree following World War II. But this action of arbitrarily passing over doctors and separating them short of a normal career who are professionally qualified seems to me to be very short-sighted since we have been asked to continue the doctors' draft. It apparently comes about because the same rules apply to the medical officers as apply to the line officers.

You have ample administrative authority to deal with that and I wish you would look into that fully and apprise this committee as to whether you think that is a wise policy to pursue? I am inserting my complete questions on this, Mr. Secretary, and the committee would appreciate a response to the questions set forth in the complete document.

I. EARLY RETIREMENT FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS

The Navy has initiated a promotion policy on medical officers which, if continued, will result in the forced early retirement of many of these officers at the prime of their professional experience, even though the Navy, like the other military services, will continue to need the doctor draft law.

The selection board last fall for captain passed over 53.8 percent of the medical commanders in the zone. The passover rate was not caused by any lack of qualifications for the higher grade but was an arbitrary application of the same attrition which was applied to the line. Sixteen of the twenty-two doctors passed over were either board certified or board eligible. This means that they have met the highest standards for American civilian medicine, including such specialties as surgery, internal medicine, neurology, and others. The board for selection to commander passed over 34.48 percent of the medical lieutenant commanders in the zone. Even though there was a great percentage of passover in the line, the medical passovers were not based on any lack of qualification but to arbitrarily assess attrition.

What will be the results

(1) The Reserve doctors under current Navy policy will be involuntarily relieved from active duty when they have twice failed of selection.

(2) The service careers of the Regular commanders if they receive two passovers, will be shortened by 4 years since they will be eliminated from service after 26 years.

(3) The military service of the lieutenant commanders who are twice failed will be shortened by 10 years from what they would normally serve if they had reached the grade of captain since they must be eliminated after 20 years of service.

(4) Many of the young Navy doctors observing this situation will very likely decide not to select or continue a Navy medical career.

This policy is open to question on several grounds.

(1) There is a valley, or a shortage, in the commander and lieutenant commander grades in the medical corps of the Navy and not a hump, or overage, as in the case of line. The need for these people as Navy doctors casts much doubt on the wisdom of applying the so-called line fraction. (An Executive order, still in effect, was issued in 1955 suspending the statutory requirement for applying the line fraction and was for the purpose of avoiding arbitrary line attrition against needed doctors.)

(2) This action is contrary to the incentive pay legislation for doctors which was to induce them to remain in active service, especially where they have attained the highest professional qualification of board eligibility and are needed by the Navy.

(3) It is inconsistent with doctor draft law which in effect, because of the shortage, forces doctors to serve in the lower grades.

The Department of Defense and the Navy have ample administrative authority to deal with this situation and the committee would like to know what is planned with regard to future policy.

Would your comments also include among other things the basis for the selection rates for the next promotion zones for all grades of Navy medical officers? Will they be considered on the basis of the medical needs of the Navy and the qualifications of the doctors, rather than an arbitrary relationship to the separate problems of the line list, and also precisely the percentage of attribution which will be assessed for each zone.

II. NO RETENTION OF MEDICAL OFFICERS AFTER 30 YEARS' SERVICE

The Navy has had authority for some years to retain medical officers on active duty beyond the normal 30-year retirement point for captains. A number have been retained in past years. Beginning in fiscal year 1959, however, it is understood that none will be retained, even though there are a number of highly qualified physicians who would voluntarily remain on active duty.

Mr. Secretary, do you think this is a wise policy in view of the continued shortage of medical officers?

Mr. FINUCANE. We will report back to you, Senator Russell, in compliance with your request.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Saltonstall?

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, I think you have covered the situation. I just have about two or three questions, Mr. Finucane. For the record for what it is worth, I have just done a little arithmetic, and as I see it, the average payment for benefits of each of the 980,000 men is \$973.

In other words, the benefit payments, each man is getting an average of about \$1,000 a year. That is dependents' allowance.

Let me ask you one further question along the lines that the chairman has asked about these reservists in the 6 months training. The chairman brought out that there are some who were being compelled to go on beyond the 2 years, although not a great percentage.

Why can't the arbitrary figure of 1 million men be increased if you have people who want to get into that 6 months training and can't now because of the limitation? That would seem to be simply an arbitrary limitation.

Mr. FINUCANE. Senator Saltonstall, the way we are arriving this year at the number of people that we require from the 6 months training is we determine the total requirements of our Reserve, we estimate the number of volunteers and the required number of obligors with 2-year service, and the balance we assign to the 6 months training. Therefore, the 6 months training picks up the balance of the requirement. We can't get it any other way. Now a man who serves 2 years in the service has given us 18 months' effective service with the ready troops. The man who goes into the Reserves we train for 6 months and we get no effective service out of him in the Regular Army. So that we would like to devote what resources we have to the Regular Establishment and use the ones who graduated from the Regular Establishments who have completed their tour of duty with our Reserves, if we can.

Presently we have 43 percent of them coming from the 6 months active duty for training.

Senator SALTONSTALL. What you are saying is that the man who has had the 2 years' training is the most valuable man you have for the next 2 years.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So you give him the preference?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And 55 percent of your total is filled up with that type of man and 45 percent with the 6 months training.

Mr. FINUCANE. No, sir; because there are many other professional guardsmen who have been in all their lives. I think we have only 25 percent of the people who come from the 2-year training as obligors. I can give you those figures exactly, sir, 6 months' trainees 43 percent, 2-year obligors, 25 percent, veterans with no obligation, that is the man who spends we will say his life to retirement in the Guard, 23 percent; and the nonprior servicemen who are men that have not ever been on active duty who were in before 1955, and will eventually leave the picture, 9 percent.

Senator SALTONSTALL. On page 7 of your statement the first paragraph you say—

looking ahead to 1963, we estimate that—despite a gradual growth of the manpower pool—about 55 percent of all 26-year-old men, and nearly 8 out of 10 qualified men, will have entered military service. The remainder again will consist of fathers or of others in deferred status.

I would be interested and I hope the committee would if you could break down that 55 percent. You say 8 out of 10 qualified men and yet only 55 percent or just a little over a half of all 26-year-old men have served. Can you break down that 55 percent figure into the physically disqualified fathers and other deferred status?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, we can, Senator Saltonstall. May I say, Mr. Chairman, the book that I referred to with all the statistical data in it in very great detail is this book which I would like to make available to the committee, and it will tell you exactly where these men are and how many of them are rejected for physical reasons and how many became married and all that data.

Senator BUSH. May I see that a minute?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir. Mr. Wool, would you specifically answer the Senator's question?

Mr. WOOL. For the men who will be 26 years of age in 1963 the total number in the population of that age will be 1,150,000. Of that total, 630,000 will either be in service or will have completed service. This will include approximately 530,000 who will have been in the Active Forces, and about 100,000 who will be fulfilling their Reserve obligations through the 6-month Reserve program. Of the remaining men now, we estimate that about 340,000 will have been found unacceptable for service under the present mental and physical standards. This leaves 180,000 men. Of these, 140,000 would be fathers other than those unfit for service, and an additional 40,000 would be men who were eligible for various types of deferments under the law including some small number of students.

We have this on a percentage basis too.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So roughly a third of all the men that are listed are out for physical or mental reasons?

Mr. WOOL. Yes, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I ask one question as to this? You have not said anything, Mr. Finucane, as to college training for officers and so on as it affects the draft and as it affects the military service.

Could you speak very briefly on that?

Mr. FINUCANE. It is our firm belief, Senator Saltonstall, and again we can't pin the numbers down, but it is our firm belief that the num-

ber of entries into the ROTC, and indeed the vigor and determination with which a student follows his career in the ROTC is directly affected by the draft. The student knows that if he does not go through and get that commission, that he is going to be turned over to his military duty as a private, and we feel that that gives us not only a greater number of ROTC officers to choose from, but we believe that they just study a little harder and treat the thing more seriously because they know if they did not complete their ROTC training they are going to be subject to the draft.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That is not leading into too many officers?

Mr. FINUCANE. The study of how many ROTC officers we need in the service is one that we are devoting a great deal of attention to, and we will have a report within I would say 2 or 3 weeks.

The figures tentatively, the Army's studied figure now is 14,000 a year and they are producing approximately that, about 13,500 last year.

The other services are about where they have always been and they are relatively smaller in numbers, I think about 4,000 for the Air Force and 2,400 for the Navy.

That is what we are presently getting. We are studying and thinking in terms of removing the requirements of the land grant colleges for compulsory ROTC for two years if they desire it, and we have several things under study, sir.

Maybe I should not be anticipating what our decisions will be.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But broadly speaking it is a good program and you are satisfied with it and you are going forward with it.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And it isn't getting too many officers.

Mr. FINUCANE. No, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Just one other question, Mr. Chairman. As one member of this committee I have had a number of requests or suggestions to cut the extension down to 2 years. I can see the merits of 4 years and I shall personally support 4 years. Now with that 4-year extension, why wouldn't it be helpful to have a committee or a commission set up to keep a continual study on the effects of the draft, the effects on our young men and for any improvements either in an administrative way or in the way of substantial law changes over the next, say, 2 years, and to make a report to the Congress.

The military certainly would not object to that, would they?

Mr. FINUCANE. I can see no objection at all, Senator. General Hershey will be here before you and he, of course, is thoroughly conversant with what is presently being done in the mechanics of the Selective Service. He could probably answer your question.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I believe if the committee or if the Congress decided that that was worthwhile, that that Commission should have a majority of civilians on it, either 3 to 2 or 5 to 4 or something of that order, so that there would be a majority of civilians representing the Congress and looking into the workings of the draft law. Personally I think that would ease some of the objections to the continuance for a 4-year term.

Mr. FINUCANE. Thank you, Senator.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And you do not object to that?

Mr. FINUCANE. No, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Just for the record, Mr. Secretary, in talking about the extension for 2 or 4 years, there is nothing to prevent the suspension of the draft at any time it is not necessary after one year or 18 months or 2 years, is there?

Mr. FINUCANE. In the wisdom of Congress they can do anything they like, Senator Russell.

Chairman RUSSELL. Will you repeat that?

Mr. FINUCANE. I just say in the wisdom of Congress they can—

Chairman RUSSELL. I am not speaking about the wisdom of Congress. I am talking about if the Congress follows the suggestion of the Department of Defense and extends the provisions of the Selective Service Act for 4 years, there is nothing that makes it mandatory that the executive branch operate the Selective Service and draft men for 4 years if they are not needed.

Mr. FINUCANE. No, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. It can be suspended at any time?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct, Senator Russell, yes. I misunderstood your statement before.

Chairman RUSSELL. There is one thing I forgot to call to your attention with respect to this medical officer situation in the Navy. The Navy has always had the authority to retain on active duty beyond the 30-year time limit those in the grade of captain.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. And they have retained some in years past. But as I understand it beginning this fiscal year none will be retained even though there are a number of highly qualified doctors who would voluntarily remain on active duty.

I wish you would consider that too in the light of the fact that we are drafting doctors, many of them against their wishes, to serve, whether it is wise to apply exactly the same criteria to these medical officers as you would to a man who might be a commander of a ship in the line having fighting men under his direction.

Senator STENNIS?

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Finucane, you certainly have a difficult job in your present role as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserves. I just want to ask you a couple of questions not directly related to this bill, but that have a bearing.

The military pay bill, I believe, now has been in effect for about 9 months and in your position what evidence do you have of its effect? Has it improved the situation any?

Mr. FINUCANE. Senator Stennis, we had a very gratifying increase in our reenlistment rates. In fiscal year 1955 only 27 percent of all enlisted men completing enlistment tours reenlisted. This has increased to about 51 percent in the first five months of fiscal year 1959. The average reenlistment rate for first term regulars, our most critical retention group, increased from 16 percent to 32 percent over the same period. The wide career incentive and reenlistment programs instituted at the courtesy of the laws that Congress has passed for us is very materially helping our reenlistment and retention problem.

Senator STENNIS. That is your personal opinion now based upon surveys you have made?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. That is your personal opinion you are giving?

Mr. FINUCANE. These are figures, sir; provided by the services.

Senator STENNIS. But you say that this was the cause of it in your opinion?

Mr. FINUCANE. I believe so.

Senator STENNIS. This military pay bill?

Mr. FINUCANE. There is only one further cause other than the improved living conditions and career incentives, of course, and that is when we have a lessening of our industrial and economic activity in the country, we get more people in the services.

Senator STENNIS. That is the next question. What 5-month period were you talking about there, what calendar months were you referring to?

Mr. FINUCANE. Starting on the 1st of July 1958, and running through November 1958, Senator.

Senator STENNIS. So in your opinion though, in spite of the lessening of industrial activities at that time, that this bill gave a substantial contribution to those figures you mentioned.

Mr. FINUCANE. We are very pleased and satisfied, sir, with the improvements that have been made, and we as yet cannot access the retention potential that has been given us by the proficiency pay, which we only put into effect on the 1st of November. It took us that long—

Senator STENNIS. I wasn't talking about proficiency pay and I wasn't talking about your being satisfied. The question was those figures that you mentioned, do you say as Assistant Secretary that the pay bill was a substantial contribution to that?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. I know you can't be exact but you do think there was a—

Mr. FINUCANE. No, I must move back a little bit. We find in some studies that the actual pay is about the sixth or seventh motivating thing in the serviceman's mind. There are many others, promotion, and career opportunities, improved survivor benefits, the medical care bill—

Senator STENNIS. The point that was emphasized here a year ago was the pay and that was given a great and paramount importance by virtually all the witnesses. These other things were mentioned, but the paramount thing that was pointed up was pay.

Mr. FINUCANE. I could not honestly say that, Senator Stennis.

Senator STENNIS. You are shaking your head. I am telling you what the testimony was and I heard all of it. Now I want to know as near as you can just how much of this improvement you attribute to this pay increase, and I think we are entitled to know.

We also were told a year ago that the services were deteriorating, about to fall apart, morale was low, and that they had definite and positive proof that the pay scale was the reason.

Now we come back a few months later and ask your opinion as to what the situation is and what contribution has this pay bill made?

Now you can't be exact on that I know, but we are entitled to your opinion and I know you are willing to give it.

You are talking about enlisted men now.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is right, sir.

Senator STENNIS. All right, do you have anything further on that?

Mr. FINUCANE. Senator Stennis, of course, I was not the one that testified last year about that. Our studies indicate that it is a well

balanced package, and pay is not always, in fact it is very seldom, the primary motive to the enlisted man. Housing is among them, medical care and support for his family.

Senator STENNIS. I did not mean to go into all that. It takes the time of the other members.

Mr. FINUCANE. Pay is a factor certainly.

Senator STENNIS. The question is in your opinion has the pay bill substantially increased this betterment of reenlistments as to enlisted men?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, I think it has.

Senator STENNIS. Now what about the officers? We had a great deal of testimony here that men were getting out of the service and so forth, and that the pay had to be increased. We accepted that testimony. Now do you have any showing here as to the result?

Mr. FINUCANE. No, we have not, Senator Stennis.

Senator STENNIS. Are you trying to make any survey on that? It is very difficult to get at I know, but it seems to me that if it could be surveyed to bring in proof before the bill was passed, there could be some effort made to bring in a survey after it was passed.

Mr. FINUCANE. We have no comparative statistics, Senator Stennis, available at this time.

Senator STENNIS. It is a little soon to expect them, I am sure. I just wanted to know if you had them. Are you making any survey along that line?

Mr. FINUCANE. We will actually try to determine those of our valuable officers who voluntarily leave the services to go to industry comparing now and then, because there is no question, Senator, that one of the prime arguments for the pay bill last year was the retention of the 45- to 50-year-old brigadier generals who we were losing to industry.

Senator STENNIS. I certainly agree to that as one who heard the testimony, but what I want to know now is what was the result?

What has happened since then?

Mr. FINUCANE. We will try to find that.

Senator STENNIS. Even though time is short, as I understood then we were going to have a report from time to time on these matters.

Mr. FINUCANE. We will do that in the near future.

Senator STENNIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. I want to say this: When you presented that bill to Senator Stennis' subcommittee last year, I was not a member of the subcommittee, but I read the hearings, and you did have a great deal of evidence where you had gone out and surveyed amongst men as to the factors that prompted them to leave the service or to reenlist. You set pay first, housing second. There were a number of elements in it. Did you quit all the surveys just because the pay bill was passed or are you going to run another one? Maybe we can get some light on that.

Mr. FINUCANE. I will attempt to develop that.

Chairman RUSSELL. This committee deals not only with pay but with housing and with these other elements and I thought that that was very helpful testimony that you submitted to Senator Stennis' subcommittee last year in that area.

And you are planning to conduct other surveys?

Mr. FINUCANE. We will do that, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. All right, Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. I haven't any questions. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Case?

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Finucane, I share a great deal, I share to a large extent the opinion expressed by the chairman that one of our objectives should be to equalize military service as far as possible, and the elimination of any discrimination or inequities in the application of the selective service law seems to me to be a very worthy objective. Now, the bill before us does nothing except to change the dateline in the present law, isn't that correct?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct, Senator.

Senator CASE. And you are making no recommendations for any improvement in the substantive law?

Mr. FINUCANE. No, sir, we are not at this time.

Senator CASE. Do you think that the present law is perfect?

Mr. FINUCANE. No, sir, but the admission of the law, Senator Case, is being done by General Hershey, and he will, I am sure, be able to answer questions regarding his organization which I am not qualified, I don't believe, Senator, to answer.

From our point of view the men are delivered to us for training in the quantities that the military at the moment require, and under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 we carry on their career until they have completed their obligation. The methods and manners in which they are selected I am sure General Hershey will be able to elaborate on.

Senator CASE. Isn't the Army concerned at all with the public relations effect of a method of getting men into the service?

Mr. FINUCANE. We are indeed, Senator Case. We certainly are very concerned about the opinion of our people of their Army at all times, and in every instance. I was not aware of too much feeling against this on account of the present operation of the draft law. I would be very concerned if I thought there was.

Senator CASE. With respect to the effect of the pay bill, have you set up tables to show the difference between the same months of the year prior to its effective date and the same months of the calendar year since it has gone into effect?

Mr. FINUCANE. We will do that. You have reference to reenlistments?

Senator CASE. I have reference to both, and what I was going to ask would be a question to distinguish between the new enlistments and the reenlistments.

Mr. FINUCANE. We will do that, sir.

Senator CASE. It seems to me that the pay bill plus the other inducements such as improved survivor benefits and improved dependent's medical care, they would have some bearing upon the number who might volunteer as a new enlistee, as well as reenlistment?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. And I think that the two things should be shown in separate tables, the new enlistees and the reenlistees.

Mr. FINUCANE. We will prepare such a table for you, Senator Case. (See p. 173.)

Senator CASE. And for the same months of the year.

Mr. FINUCANE. The same months of the year.

Senator CASE. So that this seasonal occupational effect—I don't know how we could identify a month as to economic activity, but at least it would reflect the seasonal employment.

Mr. FINUCANE. We will do that, sir.

(The following information was subsequently furnished:)

NOTES TO TABLES I AND II

The recent military pay bill was enacted as Public Law 85-422 on May 20, 1958. The increased rates of pay for officers and enlisted members under this act became effective on June 1, 1958. Initial promotions to grades E-8 and E-9 were made by all services between June and November 1958, while initial proficiency payments for enlisted members were made in November 1958. To some extent, anticipation of favorable congressional action on the pending pay bill probably contributed to the improvement in reenlistment rates in fiscal year 1958 as compared to fiscal year 1957. It is believed, however, that the effects of the pay bill may be more generally evaluated by experience in the first 6 or 7 months in fiscal year 1959, as compared to earlier periods.

The overall trend in first enlistments (table I) for the Department of Defense, as a whole, does not provide an accurate measure of the actual recruitment capabilities of the services since fiscal year 1957. This is due to the fact that, with the exception of the Army, the number of new enlistments into the regular components of the Armed Forces has been subject to ceiling limitations during the past few years.

The Army, on the other hand, has accepted all qualified applicants for regular enlistment. The increase in Army first enlistments from 43,600 in the first 7 months of fiscal year 1957 to 72,700 in the comparable period of fiscal year 1959 is therefore particularly significant. It is believed that the recent military pay bill contributed substantially to this improvement. Other pertinent factors include (1) the effects of the economic recession last year and (2) reduced requirements for new personnel in other military services (i.e., Air Force).

Reenlistment rates, shown in table II, are defined as the ratio between the number of reenlistments in a given period to the number of personnel separating who are eligible to reenlist, expressed in percentage terms. Department of Defense studies have indicated that personnel completing initial terms of enlistment (first-term regulars) constitute the most critical retention group.

It will be noted that first-term reenlistment rates averaged 31.7 percent in July-December 1958 as compared to 21.7 and 23.9 percent, respectively, in the comparable periods of the 2 preceding fiscal years—with significant improvement shown in all services. The recent military pay bill is believed to be primarily responsible for this improvement.

TABLE I.—*First enlistments¹ by service, fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1st 7 months 1959*

	Department of Defense	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
Fiscal year 1957.....	302,878	68,752	80,354	30,459	123,313
Fiscal year 1958.....	271,064	78,269	89,748	26,667	76,380
Fiscal year 1959 (1st 7 months) ²	199,754	72,709	53,386	27,182	46,477
July 1956 to January 1957.....	196,731	43,646	55,528	16,067	81,490
July 1957 to January 1958.....	157,433	41,357	51,865	15,416	48,795
July 1958 to January 1959 ²	199,754	72,709	53,386	27,182	46,477

¹ Regular enlistments only. Excludes Reserves entering active duty.

² Preliminary.

TABLE II.—*Reenlistment rates by service and category of personnel, fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1st half 1959*

	Department of Defense	Army	Navy ¹	Marine Corps	Air Force
All Regulars:					
Fiscal year 1957.....	45.9	49.6	44.9	20.1	49.4
Fiscal year 1958.....	48.6	48.1	43.7	39.8	54.8
Fiscal year 1959 (1st half).....	50.8	53.9	35.8	38.6	61.5
July to December 1956.....	45.0	49.8	42.5	32.4	47.5
July to December 1957.....	43.5	46.4	41.1	30.9	45.6
July to December 1958.....	50.8	53.9	35.8	38.6	61.5
1st term Regulars:					
Fiscal year 1957.....	24.7	18.9	15.6	17.0	36.5
Fiscal year 1958.....	27.6	17.2	22.6	24.2	39.8
Fiscal year 1959 (1st half).....	31.7	22.8	24.6	25.3	45.7
July to December 1956.....	23.9	19.3	13.4	20.0	34.6
July to December 1957.....	21.7	14.5	18.1	16.1	30.6
July to December 1958.....	31.7	22.8	24.6	25.3	45.7
Career Regulars:					
Fiscal year 1957.....	85.8	83.2	85.8	83.1	91.4
Fiscal year 1958.....	85.2	80.4	89.0	82.5	91.8
Fiscal year 1959 (1st half).....	87.7	85.0	90.6	77.0	92.1
July to December 1956.....	87.4	84.7	89.0	83.2	90.9
July to December 1957.....	84.4	79.9	87.7	82.5	91.3
July to December 1958.....	87.7	85.0	90.6	77.0	92.1
Inductees:					
Fiscal year 1957.....		2.7			
Fiscal year 1958.....		4.7			
Fiscal year 1959 (1st half).....		4.7			
July to December 1956.....		2.2			
July to December 1957.....		4.0			
July to December 1958.....		4.7			

¹ Reduction in Navy reenlistment rate for all Regulars between fiscal years 1957 and 1959 due to fact that first-termers (whose reenlistment rates are much lower than for career personnel) accounted for a much larger proportion of the total separating group in fiscal year 1959 than in fiscal year 1957.

Senator CASE. How many young men become of draft age each year at the present time?

Mr. WOOL. Currently between 1,100,000 and 1,200,000, depending upon the year.

Senator CASE. How many men did you induct in the last 12 months?

Mr. FINUCANE. One hundred and fifteen thousand.

Senator CASE. How many new enlistments did you have in the same period?

Mr. WOOL. The number of enlistments estimated for the current fiscal year—

Senator CASE. I want a figure for the same period as 115,000. If you inducted 115,000 during a certain 12-month period, what was the number of new enlistments, volunteers, during that same period?

Mr. WOOL. I have them by fiscal year, sir, and for fiscal year 1958, to put it on a comparable basis, during fiscal year 1958 the inductions were 126,556. The first enlistments were 271,000. That is, of course, into active duty. There were 55,767 reserves who entered active duty, almost all new men, during that fiscal year. In addition there were 170,000 reenlistments immediately and 55,700 who reenlisted with some interruption of service.

Senator CASE. The people then who for the first time took the oath of military service during fiscal year 1958 would be the first 3 figures you gave me, the 126,000 inductees, the 271,000 first-time enlistees, the 55,000 who went into the Reserve.

Mr. WOOL. That's right, sir. That is for active duty.

Senator CASE. That makes a total of 453,000 if my quick computation is correct.

Mr. WOOL. Yes.

Senator CASE. That would be 453,000 out of 1,100,000 who became of military age.

Mr. WOOL. That's right.

Senator CASE. That is less than 50 percent.

Mr. WOOL. Yes. What you are doing, of course, is to relate the current intakes into the Active Forces only to the numbers currently reaching age 18. In addition to that, approximately 100,000 during that fiscal year I believe entered the Reserves under the 6 months program. I can verify the exact figure in a minute.

Senator CASE. That is in addition to the 55,000?

Mr. WOOL. That is in addition to that total you just computed.

Senator CASE. That would be 553,000 out of approximately the 1,100,000.

Mr. WOOL. That's right.

Senator CASE. How do you reconcile, Mr. Secretary, the first time military service entry of 553,000 out of 1,100,000 becoming of military age with your statement that 9 out of 10 enter the service?

Mr. FINUCANE. I believe, sir, we stated, and we have definite figures in the book that will answer each question, but in addition to the 553,000 you have some 340,000 that for mental, physical, or other reasons are not included, and you have a very small amount, I think it is less than 40,000 fathers, so what our statement was, that nine out of ten 26 year olds who are fully qualified would serve. I think you will see if you take all those figures they will total up.

Senator CASE. I expect to take this study that you have referred to and make some study of it.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. But it does seem to me that the conclusion that you draw does not give quite the frank picture to the public. Now, of course, if one third, if 340,000 of 1,150,000, are disqualified for physical or mental reasons, that I think will come as quite a shock to the public as a whole.

I didn't suppose that one-third of the men becoming of military age would be ruled out on either physical or mental grounds.

Mr. FINUCANE. What is the figure this year? It was given a few minutes ago?

Senator CASE. The figure on rejections, sir?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes.

Mr. WOOL. With respect to rejections if we are talking about the current rate for the population as a whole, it is approximately one-third of an age class based upon current standards, sir. Now, one thing I would like to clarify with respect to these figures if I may is that our conclusions as to the extent to which men have served or not served is based upon the experience of men who are currently completing their period of service obligation, since under the law they may enter at any age up to their 26th birthday, apart from those who are deferred, of course.

The statistics cited referring to 9 out of 10 qualified men having served are accurate statistics based upon actual counts for men currently reaching age 26. The projections referred to for 1963 are for men who will be reaching age 26 at that time; it is true, sir, that the total manpower pool is increasing over this period of time because each year we are taking fewer men into service than the number of qualified men reaching the age.

Senator CASE. Yes. I recognize that there is a check point here and you can get a little confusion. You can talk on the one hand about those who are becoming of military age, the age to register, and you can talk at the other end of the spectrum where they are passing the age of 26. Is there no liability for induction after age 26 now?

Mr. WOOL. Just for those men whose liability has been extended because of a deferment. Those men have a continued liability until their 35th birthday, but the number available over 26 is quite small.

Senator CASE. And that is all to accommodate those who for educational reasons or something like that have accepted a deferment.

Mr. WOOL. That is right, sir.

Senator CASE. Would you give us a little breakdown on this 340,000 who are disqualified?

Mr. WOOL. Yes.

Senator CASE. That is as to what portion of them are for physical unfitness and what for mental.

Mr. WOOL. I should explain that our basic statistics on rejections are based upon those men who have not enlisted but have remained in the draft pool until they are reached for a draft board examination. This excludes large numbers of men who have enlisted before 18½ or before 19, so that the base, based upon the registrants referred for examination, excludes a great many qualified men who have enlisted before being reached for an examination.

Senator CASE. There should be a compensating correction.

Mr. WOOL. Yes, there is, and the 33 percent figure is related to the total population of an age class rather than just to those who are referred for draft board examinations.

Senator CASE. That washes itself out, doesn't it?

Mr. WOOL. Yes, it does. Now we do have the breakdown of those who were examined through draft board examinations. Of the total examined in the period August through December 1958 we have 54.6 percent who were found acceptable and approximately 45.4 percent who were disqualified.

This is higher because it excludes the qualified men previously accepted through enlistment.

Senator CASE. I recognize that point, but now of the 45.4?

Mr. WOOL. Of this group now we have a total of 18 percent, 17.9, who were rejected because of medical disqualifications only.

Senator BUSH. How much is that again?

Mr. WOOL. 17.9 percent of the total number examined.

Senator CASE. Medical?

Mr. WOOL. Yes, sir. Sixteen and three-tenths were disqualified because of failure on the mental test only. An additional 5.9 percent were disqualified because of limited trainability. They got a minimum score of 10 on the mental test, but failed to meet the Army aptitude standards authorized last year. Three and two-tenths percent failed both the mental and the medical standards, and 2.1 percent were administratively disqualified for various reasons.

Senator BUSH. For what?

Mr. WOOL. For various reasons. Some of them had prison records, some of them had some other basis.

Senator BUSH. Does that make up your 45 percent?

Mr. WOOL. It should.

Senator CASE. That is for what date?

Mr. WOOL. This covers the period August through December 1958.

Senator CASE. Does that embrace then the period after which the standards were raised?

Mr. WOOL. Yes, sir. The higher standards became effective at the beginning of August.

Senator CASE. Were those standards spelled out in the law that we passed or was it the authority to revise the standards that was given?

Mr. WOOL. The authority was given to the President. Testimony was presented at the hearings indicating what standards the Army and the Department of Defense would impose, and those standards have been imposed through the authority given to the President.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Senator CASE. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I have listened with a great deal of interest to these last figures. I don't see that those correlate with the statement that Mr. Finucane made to me a little while ago that about 33 percent were out for physical reasons. Now you are putting it up to 45.

Mr. WOOL. Senator, I tried to explain that before. The difference is due to the fact that these figures relate to the numbers of draft registrants referred during a particular period of time by the draft boards for examination. These figures do not include in the base the numbers of men who have enlisted in the same age class of the population and were accepted as fully qualified. When we relate the numbers of disqualifications to the total population, the 45 percent figure becomes approximately 33 percent.

Senator BUSH. May I ask a question there appropos of this? The figure of 45 percent nevertheless relates to—how big a body of men does it relate to, could you say?

Mr. WOOL. Yes. I can give you some illustration of the numbers who are examined during a period of time. Approximately perhaps 400,000 a year. General Hershey would have a more precise figure.

Senator BUSH. It seems to me that 45 percent is a very high figure. I am amazed that it is that high, even within this group that excludes those who enlisted. I suppose it also excludes those who may have become officers through the various college training programs.

Mr. WOOL. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSH. They are all excluded too.

Mr. WOOL. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSH. What percentage would it be if you took into account not only those who enlisted but also those students who get commissions through the various college training programs?

Mr. WOOL. The 33 percent rejection rates includes the entire population.

Senator STENNIS. All right, Senator Case.

Senator CASE. Mr. Secretary, who prepared the standards which the President promulgated under the authority of the law passed last year?

Mr. FINUCANE. We have four categories which we have had for a long time, and as I remember it, and it was done by the Department of the Army, we simply excluded—we took a higher place on the scale in category IV, and I think we excluded between 10 and 30. Prior to that time we had taken them; is that correct?

MR. WOOL. Yes; that is the general picture, sir. The Army recommended and the Secretary of Defense approved the standards currently in effect under this new authority. These standards provide precisely that in the case of those men who score in mental group IV—this ranges from a score of 10 to 30 percentiles on the AFQT, a supplementary aptitude screening test is administered, and only those men who score a minimum acceptable score on this more comprehensive aptitude test are accepted in this category.

SENATOR CASE. That is very interesting but that wasn't exactly an answer to the question I asked. The question I asked was who did it? Was it only the Army?

MR. FINUCANE. We have the same qualifications for all services, but the Army had a greater percentage, Senator. All services still take category IV men in various degrees, and we have a need for them, of course. We simply have tried to use this aptitude test because there are many low category IV men who would make excellent mechanics or something.

In other words we have many duties in the services.

SENATOR CASE. You are still telling me what you did. I am wondering who did it.

MR. FINUCANE. The man, I couldn't say, sir.

SENATOR CASE. I mean was it the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, was it the Department of Defense, was it done in the name of all of them?

MR. FINUCANE. The Army have their own testing programs. We have the same testing programs for all three services and I am pretty sure that—was it done by the Department of Defense?

MR. WOOL. Specifically the standard applies to induction. The only service currently utilizing inductees is the Army. The Army, therefore is using it.

SENATOR CASE. So it was the Army that made the recommendations to the President?

MR. WOOL. Yes, sir.

SENATOR CASE. Now, then, were the standards which the Army recommended higher, lower, or the same that the Navy and the Air Force used for volunteer enlistments?

MR. WOOL. The standards are approximately the same. The tests used for screening this marginal group of inductees, is the Army Classification Battery. The other services use somewhat different screening tests, but the effects are approximately the same under these various tests.

SENATOR CASE. Then it would be safe to say that anyone who is inducted today could also get into the Navy or the Air Force if he wanted to enlist?

MR. FINUCANE. That is not quite a fair statement. It is a fair statement but I think it is not quite accurate.

We have a higher percentage of category IV's entering the Army through induction than in the other two services through enlistments. If the other two services' percentage quotas of category IV's were full, at the recruitment center they would not accept additional category IV's.

SENATOR STENNIS. Anything further, Senator?

SENATOR CASE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a few more questions. What is the Reserve liability for the several categories today? First of all what is the Reserve liability for the 2-year inductee?

Mr. FINUCANE. The 2-year inductee must serve his 2 years and then serve a minimum of 2 years in the Ready Reserve on a pay drill status if he is so assigned.

Colonel DICKENS. According to law the man who serves 2 years' active duty must remain in the Ready Reserve for the balance of 5 years. It is being implemented by the Army as follows. If a man joins a unit of Reserves, he can serve only 2 additional years or a total of 4 years in the active service and the Ready Reserve. If he does not join a unit he will serve a total of 5 years in the Ready Reserve, counting the 2 on active duty.

Senator CASE. That is a total of 5 years' liability then?

Colonel DICKENS. Five years both active service and Ready Reserve service.

Senator CASE. Let's start again. A man is inducted for 2 years' active duty. What additional liability does he have after those 2 years are completed?

Mr. FINUCANE. Two years Ready Reserve, Senator, if he is assigned to a unit and 3 years if he is not assigned to a unit.

Colonel DICKENS. He then has 1 more year in the Standby Reserve.

Senator CASE. So that is a total of 5 years' liability?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir, 5 years' active service and Ready Reserve.

Senator CASE. What is the liability for a man who enlists and for how many years may he enlist at a time?

Mr. FINUCANE. He can enlist for 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years, or 6 years, sir, depending on the service and the condition of the enlistment.

Senator CASE. If he enlists for 2 years, what is his additional liability?

Mr. FINUCANE. If he is assigned to a unit it is 2 years in the Ready Reserve and 2 years in the Standby. If he is in the pool it is 3 years in the Ready Reserve or a total of 5 years of active and 1 Ready Reserve.

Senator CASE. And what about the man who enlists for 3 years?

Mr. FINUCANE. He would have 1 year less. It still 5 years of active and Reserve service but he has served 3 so he has 2 to go, and if he enlisted for 5 years, he has no further obligation.

Senator CASE. So there is a 5-year liability for active duty or a combination of Active and Reserve liability?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct, Senator Case.

Senator CASE. What is the comparative value to the military service of a man who is in for 3 years as compared with the man who is in for 2 years on active duty?

Mr. FINUCANE. We would like always, Senator Case, to have the longest possible tour a man can give us. In the first place as he proceeds with his profession in the normal case he becomes more valuable and learns more about the service. If he stays longer, it means that we have to retrain somebody to take his place less often, which reduces the pressure on our establishment and our funds and our trainers.

Senator CASE. Have you translated that into dollars?

Mr. FINUCANE. I don't think I could be prepared to give it to you here, but I will try to put it in the record for you, Senator Case. I am perfectly sure that by counting the training costs of reproducing our people in the service that we can give you those figures.

Senator CASE. I am just going to mention an illustration. You might have this in mind as you work up that answer. If you had 100 men for 3 years, you get 300 man-years of service, of active service.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

Senator CASE. Out of those 3 years of active service, how much of it would be duty service and how much of it would be training?

Mr. FINUCANE. We know, sir, that the first 6 months on active duty is entirely devoted to training, so that we do not get effective use out of a man until he has been in the service 6 months. That is 25 percent of a 2-year tour of duty, and it is only say 12 or 14 percent of a 3-year tour of duty, and it would go down.

We will give that to you accurately, sir, for the record. (See Appendix I.)

Senator CASE. If you had 200 men for 2 years of active duty you would get a total of 400 man-years of service. But if you would subtract from that then the 6 months' training period, you would actually get only 300 man-years of duty.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct.

(The following information was subsequently furnished:)

All persons below age 26, who enter the Armed Forces for programs involving active military training and service, have a total military obligation of 6 years which includes active and Reserve service. After completion of active service, each such person must serve in the Ready Reserve for a period which when added to the active service period equals 5 years, and thereafter 1 year in Standby Reserve status. Accordingly, the person who serves 2 years on active duty, has a remaining obligation of 3 years in the Ready Reserve and 1 year in the Standby Reserve. A person completing a 4-year active service enlistment has a remaining obligation of 1 year in the Ready Reserve and 1 year in the Standby Reserve. Since the total prescribed active and Ready Reserve service is 5 years, the person serving longer in active service serves a shorter period in the Ready Reserve.

The foregoing describes the statutory maximum period of Ready Reserve obligation. Under various administrative regulations authorized by law, the period of Ready Reserve service may be shorter than the maximum. For example, the 2-year inductee who is assigned to a unit where he must participate in 48 drills and 2 weeks of active duty for training each year, has his Ready Reserve obligation reduced to 2 years. Such a person serves 2 years on active duty, 2 years in the Ready Reserve, and 2 years in Standby Reserve status. On the other hand, the 2-year inductee who is not required to participate in 48 drills and 2 weeks of active duty, has the standard remaining obligation of 3 years in the Ready Reserve and 1 year in the Standby Reserve.

Senator CASE. I recognize that in taking those figures—and I used those figures just because it is rather simple to use an even hundred—on the face of it your 100 men for 3 years would give you 300 man-years of service. The 200 for 2 years would give you 300 man-years of duty. Now those are not quite comparable because we have not subtracted anything for the training period of the 3-year men. But I think it does illustrate that it would seem to me, on your own statement, to be more attractive or almost as attractive to have 100 men for 3 years as to have 200 men for 2 years each.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is right, sir.

Senator CASE. It is not quite that because we have not allowed for the training period of the 100 men. But if that is so, and if you say that the longer the man is in the more valuable he becomes, the more dividends you get, I would think that you would come up with a recommendation to change this period of reserve liability so as to encourage

the men to take a longer tour of active duty, and thereby get greater dividends.

MR. FINUCANE. Senator Case, we have a pattern to fit almost any man's desire, and the other services in fact—when I say the other services—

Senator CASE. But whatever he does he has a 5-year liability. And I am sure from the young men that have talked with me that a lot of them feel that if they could take their service and say "This is it" and have a definite period of service, that they would go in for a longer period of service if they knew when that was done they would be through except in the case of a total mobilization.

MR. FINUCANE. Of course, that option is open to them now. If they want to join the Air Force they have no further service when they come out if they take a 5-year enlistment.

Senator CASE. If they take a 5-year enlistment.

MR. FINUCANE. Yes, and the Air Force presently has a minimum of 4 years.

Senator CASE. That is no choice because they have a 5-year liability under these others. You say if they would take a 5-year—they have taken the 5 years. That is no choice between 5 years and 5 years either way.

MR. FINUCANE. The minimum enlistment in the Air Force today, Senator Case, is 4 years, and the Air Force is right up to strength. Obviously many young men are willing to serve tours of duty longer than 2 years. The only 2-year tours of duty we have are the inductees or the enlistees in lieu of induction.

Senator CASE. If they serve 4 years in the Air Force, is that it?

MR. FINUCANE. They have one year of Ready Reserve.

Senator CASE. They have what?

MR. FINUCANE. One year left, sir.

Senator CASE. But to the extent that the Air Force is up, and I think there are other factors and motivations that enter into enlistment in the Air Force possibly, it would seem to me, and the point I am trying to make, if they can reduce the uncertainty after they have had their military service and go ahead with their business plans, with their family plans or whatever they have, I think you will find your enlistments would go up, Army, Navy and Air Force so far as that is concerned, and I propose, Mr. Chairman, if I can, to work with the staff and try to work up some amendment that may be offered on this bill to that effect.

I don't quite understand the reason for bringing in this bill, which is a simple extension of the Selective Service Act, without some recommendations to deal with the Reserve situation.

I recognize that possibly when you have gotten an extension of the Selective Service Act, if you get it just simply that the pressure will be off as far as the Defense Department is concerned to look for any possible modifications in Reserve liability or the operations of the Selective Service Act.

Senator STENNIS. The Chair feels that any work the Senator from South Dakota does on that subject or any other part of the bill would be helpful to the committee.

Senator CASE. I hope that the Defense Department will help me out on this a little bit.

MR. FINUCANE. We will.

Senator CASE. I don't want to come in with some cold amendments which I might draft in my office and think this meets my point, because I recognize that everything like this has its practical aspects, too, of workability.

I wish that somebody from your office might come up sometime and talk with me about working out some amendments that would possibly meet the objective which the chairman expressed of eliminating some the inequities in the way the service laws work.

Mr. FINUCANE. We will be pleased to, Senator Case, and we will.

Senator STENNIS. Thank you, Senator Case. At this point I wish to include in the record a statement submitted by the Secretary of Defense:

STATEMENT OF NEIL H. McELROY, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I submit this statement in support of what I consider one of the most important components of our fiscal year 1959 legislative program. I refer, of course, to H.R. 2260. This bill would continue until July 1, 1963, certain necessary authorities which have existed for a number of years. I am firmly convinced that our military posture would be dangerously weakened if these authorities should cease to be available to the Armed Forces on July 1, 1959, their present date of expiration.

The United States is today maintaining vast, ready military power capable of meeting either a limited or general war situation. The President, the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after assessing the strengths of our allies, the strengths of our potential enemies, and the effectiveness of our modern weapons systems, have collectively determined what our defense structure should be. Our present Armed Forces strength goals represent what we believe to be a reasonable and realistic assessment of our manpower needs in flexible combination with all other elements of our strength.

Extension of the induction authority, including the provision for placing special calls for medical and dental personnel, is necessary to the maintenance of our military strength goals. This authority enables us to meet deficits in our voluntary procurement programs. Additionally, the suspension of the active duty strength ceilings must be continued to accommodate our present goals. Termination of the suspension would have the effect of reducing our total active duty strengths to about 2,000,000. Finally, the benefits of the Dependents Assistance Act should be continued until July 1, 1963, in order to alleviate hardship to dependents of enlisted personnel, including inductees, now in the service as well as those who will enter the service in the future.

Extension of these authorities will provide further assurance to the rest of the free world that we intend to honor our military commitments. It will also alert any potential enemies to the fact that there is to be no lessening of efforts on our part to resist aggression.

We most respectfully urge the Congress to enact H.R. 2260.

Senator STENNIS. The Chair proposes to call on Senator Bartlett now, but before doing so, let's take a little inventory of our time here.

We have Dr. Berry, who will be the next witness, and then we have General Hershey and we want ample time for the witnesses, of course, and all the committee members.

But if it is reasonably possible to complete those two witnesses and finish with Secretary Finucane by 1 o'clock, if it is agreeable to the members and the witnesses, we could proceed until 1 anyway.

Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARLETT. Mr. Secretary, why is it that the Department recommended an extension of exactly 4 years on Selective Service?

Mr. FINUCANE. The history of the bill since 1948 has been that it has been considered in 4 year times. As I stated in the opening statement, we feel that it will do two things as a minimum and many other things from the military point of view, but two things as a minimum.

It will show the determination of our people to back up their commitments overseas, most particularly in Germany, and it will indicate to our young people that we do not have any intention of changing our military posture or our program through fiscal year 1963. So that the young man will not be tempted to change his career pattern with the hope that at the end of a certain period of months that the law will expire and he will therefore not be eligible.

Senator BARTLETT. Would we infer properly then that the 4-year recommendation is in furtherance of tradition more or less as to a specific number of years, since there were similar extensions in 1951 and in 1955?

Mr. FINUCANE. Senator, I just noted the tradition.

The reasons, however, are the showing of our determination to maintain a strength and not encourage any letting down among our NATO allies in the face of the problems that are facing us in Europe today.

Senator BARTLETT. A witness who appeared here yesterday, Mr. Secretary, said I believe that Great Britain is going to end their draft entirely. Are we to regard that as a slackening of effort on their part or are their circumstances different?

Mr. FINUCANE. I don't believe their circumstances are different, and I do not know the motivation. I would deplore the fact if any one of our allies, and I would not certainly like to single out Great Britain, in any way slackened their requirements to the NATO countries. Now whether Britain can maintain the commitments that she has made without induction due to a different type of economy they have or a different motivation of their people I am not in a position to say. But I am quite confident that we must not, particularly at this time, show any divergence from our stated programs and commitments around the world, and I am sure you feel that way too, Senator.

Senator BARTLETT. You would not see a need for a longer extension and very vigorously oppose a shorter one, is that right?

Mr. FINUCANE. I believe that is a fair statement, sir.

Senator BARTLETT. No more questions.

Senator STENNIS. Secretary Finucane, we certainly thank you for your very extensive testimony here, the extensive questions at least and your answers to those questions.

I wanted to go a little further with you on the results of this pay bill, but I realize that time is short, that it has not been in operation too long. You referred to the figures you have accumulated there and it is very timely that you would accumulate them with reference to the enlisted men.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. Would you give us those in the form of a letter or a memorandum? You have cited some of them already for the record but I wish you would complete that as memorandum for the record.

Mr. FINUCANE. I would like to do that. (See p. 173.)

Senator STENNIS. It would be very helpful to us. I will forego any further questions on it now and write you a letter if I may to point up some things that we want you to help us on. We certainly do thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. FINUCANE. I appreciate your courtesy. Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator STENNIS. Dr. Berry, come around, will you please, sir?

Dr. Berry, you are always helpful to the committee. You have a statement and we don't want to limit your time at all.

You may insert it in the record, Doctor, and I wish you would point out the high points of it though and then we will have questions.

**STATEMENT OF DR. FRANK B. BERRY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
DEFENSE (HEALTH AND MEDICAL)**

Dr. BERRY. Senator Stennis and Mr. Chairman, I am Dr. Frank, B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical). I am very happy to appear again before this committee in support of the House bill, H.R. 2260, that applies to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, and to answer any questions you may have concerning the Selective Service Act as it affects these professional men.

As you know since 1950 the military services have been forced to rely on the existence of the draft law to meet their requirements for physicians and dentists. The doctor draft law was permitted to expire on July 1, 1957. As a substitute the Congress provided authority for the President to issue special calls for physicians and dentists who were liable for military service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

In other words, physicians and dentists liable for service who were granted educational deferments from military service for the purpose of obtaining a medical and dental education are subject to special calls up to age 35.

This extended liability to age 35 for physicians and dentists is the same as for any other registrant who has been deferred to complete his education.

I am happy to report to you that both physicians and dentists have volunteered in sufficient numbers to meet Department of Defense needs for fiscal years 1958 and 1959 and it has not been necessary to place special draft calls.

However, because of knowledge throughout the medical profession that the authority to place special calls expires July 1, 1959, there has been a decrease in the number of physician volunteers and it appears that we may not obtain enough physicians to meet the full quota of our needs.

However, in the past 30 days there has been improvement and we hope and believe that if favorable action is taken on the proposed legislation the publicity will result in a sufficient number of volunteers to meet the complete quota.

In this connection it should be noted that the U.S. Public Health Service also benefits from the legislation since a physician or dentist can satisfy his obligation for military service by volunteering for duty with the Public Health Service.

Our medical officer replacement requirement is less than in previous years. The Department of Defense has shown a net gain of 1,000 career medical officers and 400 career dental officers since passage of Public Law 497, the Medical and Dental Officers Career Incentive Act of 1956. The reduced yearly replacement requirement is due to the effectiveness of that act in making a career in the military medical service more attractive to physicians and dentists.

We have a series of charts on which we could show this to you graphically if you desire. We have now reached the long-sought

period where we have more physicians graduating from medical school with a liability for military service than are needed on active duty by the Armed Forces.

About 5,000 graduates each year will be liable for military service. This favorable situation should make it much easier to meet our needs by voluntary means if there is no change in the obligation to serve. We recognize the fact as I mentioned 2 years ago that most of our volunteers are obligated volunteers.

This legislation (H.R. 2260) serves as the impetus for these young men either to volunteer for duty or to participate in our residency training deferment program.

The services have current procurement programs which provide a substantial number of physicians and dentists for active duty.

Military internships have been one source; the senior medical student program has also contributed; the largest number are obtained, however, from the young physicians who are deferred to undergo specialty training and who upon completion enter the service.

The residency training deferment program, together with our career residency training programs, provide a sizable number of physicians for active duty and also provide the required number of specialists and experienced physicians needed by the Armed Forces in the foreseeable future.

At the present time, then with the occurrence and cooperation of selective service, we have about 2,600 physicians in a deferred status undergoing residency training in civilian hospitals in the various medical and surgical specialties. About 700 will complete their required training in July of 1959 and we expect to have an annual input of approximately 800-900.

This program permits the physician to indicate during his intern year whether he wishes to (1) be deferred for specialty training, (2) volunteer for active duty upon completion of his internship, or (3) delay his entry into service for a period up to 1 year.

Physicians who participate are permitted to state their service preference and the quarter of the year in which they prefer to enter on duty. Over 85 percent of the expressed preferences have been honored by the military departments. The vast majority of these physicians prefer to come on duty immediately following completion of their internship or residency. Active duty at this time is frequently more acceptable to the individual, the civilian medical profession, and the services.

Each of these young men during his military service will gain not only experience in clinical medicine, but also invaluable military experience and training.

It is my sincere belief that these physicians upon return to civilian practice will provide our Nation with additional young professional personnel trained to furnish the guidance and leadership which would be so vitally needed in civil defense activities to protect the interests and welfare of our country in the event of an emergency situation.

I would like to say here, Mr. Chairman, that a 4-year extension of the act is not only desirable from the standpoint of the Defense Department but from the standpoint of the young men studying medicine and dentistry, as well, since it gives each one the opportunity to know where he stands 4 years in advance.

He realizes he has a military obligation and he is able to work out his future plans more satisfactorily.

We believe we have made good progress in solving a most difficult procurement problem for the Armed Forces. It is our opinion that the success of these procurement programs is in a large measure due to the fact that young physicians and dentists, realizing they have an obligation to serve, prefer to volunteer and fulfill it at their own convenience rather than wait for the selective service call.

Unless some provision is made for the selective call-up of this group, the number of physicians and dentists who volunteer will be inadequate to meet our present and future replacement needs. We strongly recommend that your committee take favorable action on H.R. 2260.

Senator STENNIS. Dr. Berry, I just have one question. I want to preface that with a factual statement very briefly. I understand you have 3.4 physicians per 1,000 troop strength; is that correct?

Dr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. And on your dentists it is 2?

Dr. BERRY. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. Per 1,000?

Dr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. That seemed very high to me as a civilian. That opinion is shared by a number of people that have served in your profession. I am not the one to decide as I don't know, but what surveillance do you exercise of that question?

Dr. BERRY. We do exercise surveillance, in part by a great deal of travel. Members from my particular office have visited all medical installations that we know of all over the world in the past 5 years, and we meet with the groups, see their work while we are there.

Senator STENNIS. Pardon me, I mean surveillance over the actual need now as to whether or not you actually need this many medical men?

Dr. BERRY. As you understand, sir, this is based entirely on troop strength. There is a fallacy in ratios per se. For instance, any one of the services were to become smaller, they would still have their basic units that they would have to supply with medical officer strength.

At the present time, with the added number of increased specialties and special situations in poisonings, toxicology, the use of all our new metals and poisons, our tremendous extensions in the air, space, and under the sea, we have many specialties that we do not have adequate numbers of applicants for.

We believe that the specialty of military medicine should be more emphasized than it is.

Now on the other side that ratio does not at all include the great number of dependents who are entitled to care, which practically doubles the number to be furnished medical care.

Senator STENNIS. I want to bring up medical care and items of that kind.

Senator Saltonstall?

Senator SALTONSTALL. I just have one question, Dr. Berry. On page 3 of your statement you say you have about 2,600 physicians in a deferred status and that you will have 700 completing their required training and expect an annual input of approximately 800 to 900.

You further say that 85 percent of expressed preferences have been honored in military departments, and the vast majority prefer to come in immediately on completion of their internship. As I interpret those two statements together, that means you are getting enough young people coming into the medical service that will take up their obligation for service while they are young and just after they have completed their internship, and that 85 percent of them get what they want.

Dr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. My question is does that give you the quality of medical skill in the armed services that is needed and is desirable?

Dr. BERRY. Yes, that is based each year on a calculation from the services themselves, giving us the number that they would like to have deferred to undergo residency training.

The figure 2,600 physicians that you see in the first paragraph of that are those deferred for advanced residency training. That scheme was first put into effect 5 years ago.

The services have honored every one of their commitments and the only defalcations and defaults have been on the part of men in that residency training.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That gives you the top surgeons, we will say.

Dr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. The top medical experts?

Dr. BERRY. That gives us a fully trained group. The next group is those who arrange with the services for delay in call to duty up to a year, which gives us some partially trained specialists, and the third group are those who wish to come in directly after their 1 year of internship. Nobody is accepted without his 1 year of internship.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Doctor, do you believe that the average young physician who is entering the Armed Forces today is qualified to perform the type of medical service that is needed?

Dr. BERRY. Oh, yes, sir, let's take the surgeon himself. He is deferred to meet the needs for qualified surgeons up to the completion of his full residency training to take his American Board examinations, which will be either 4 or 5 years.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you.

Senator STENNIS. Senator Case?

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one line of questions. Dr. Berry, what proportion of the Reserve doctors have been recalled for a second tour of duty before other doctors are called for the first time?

Dr. BERRY. A great many were in the Korean days, sir, but we do not recall anybody now.

Senator CASE. You do not recall anybody now?

Dr. BERRY. No, sir. We have some voluntary applications but they have not been recalled, unless they have voluntarily applied for duty.

Senator CASE. Yesterday, Dr. Harold Glattly, representing the National Medical Veterans Society suggested that the bill be amended so that no doctors would be recalled before other eligibles had served except in an acute emergency. Your testimony is that that is not being done now?

Dr. BERRY. That is not being done now. I think that applied particularly to the group of young men who accept their commission

before the age of 26, when by law they are forced to go into the Ready Reserve at the completion of their 2 years.

Senator CASE. That is all.

Senator STENNIS. Thank you, Senator. Dr. Berry, do you have something further?

Dr. BERRY. No, sir.

Senator STENNIS. We certainly thank you very much.

General Hershey, will you come around, please?

General Hershey always comes in here with a bag of troubles for the committee.

We are glad to have you, General. You have a prepared statement I believe.

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY, DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

General HERSHEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, if you will, I have a short statement which I will read.

Senator STENNIS. Very well.

General HERSHEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

During the past two decades I have appeared before your committee from time to time in connection with selective service legislation.

On each occasion that the question of extension of selective service legislation came up I have believed that without it the jeopardy of the Nation would be increased. History has sustained this belief.

I appear again before you today in support of the President's request for extension of the selective service induction authority for another 4 years, because I see nothing in world conditions suggesting a possibility of cessation of this authority.

Selective service legislation is based on need—that is a need to build and maintain our Armed Forces through direct and indirect means to the minimum strength level to assure an adequate defense; a need to reassure our allies of our determination not to weaken, and at the same time denying any would-be aggressor any comfort that he could take from signs of weakness in our defense effort.

The need, so far as the strength of our military forces is concerned, is dramatically pointed up by the situation that existed in the spring of 1948. At that time I appeared before your committee in support of the President's request for the reestablishment of selective service because of the inability of the services to maintain a strength of 1,400,000 men. Today, the legislation is needed to continue to insure the maintenance of the strength of over 2½ million in the Armed Forces.

The Defense Department witnesses have, I think, clearly demonstrated the need for the extension of the induction authority to maintain the military force and I fully concur in their statements on this subject.

I think at this time when we are hearing some suggestions on the need for modification of the law and the manner in which the System operates, I would like to take a few moments to review our manpower experience.

Historically under threat of war, nations have always been faced with the difficult problem of how to raise and maintain armed forces.

Over the years many methods have been tried, but basic to all successful methods has been one requirement, and that was that the obligation to serve be placed upon every able-bodied man in the community who could be spared. Our own history, beginning with the Thirteen Colonies, all of which had one or more laws, as a matter of fact they had about 600 altogether, requiring service of all inhabitants, down to the present time, demonstrates that adequate Armed Forces cannot be raised in time of emergency without some type of system to compel individuals to discharge their military obligation.

The present system has its genesis in the laws of the Original Colonies, and has developed through the years, on both sides in the sixties, in World War I, World War II, and Korea to the present time.

The basic grassroots system largely developed in World War I has not really been changed. The Congress has wisely seen fit to preserve in the legislation the flexibility that had made it easily adaptable to conditions existing during the so-called war, as well as during a fighting war. The present law, which was enacted in 1948, was flexible enough to meet the conditions in Korea, as well as present-day conditions. It can meet conditions which may change radically and suddenly for the worse.

During this period of time this country has engaged in two wars, Service System, operated by the thousands of local uncompensated citizens, have registered and classified about 70 million persons. They have inducted into the service nearly 13 million persons in the process of raising and maintaining the largest armies in the world. At the same time, they have assured the maintenance of an adequate and effective national economy.

During this period of time this country has engaged in two wars, one of major proportions, and at no time have we been free of the threat of grave danger. Today, with this system in operation, our active and reserve forces are at required strength, our national economy suffers no ill effects from the withdrawal by these local boards of sufficient numbers of men to enter the military service, and there has been no serious disruption to our vital scientific endeavors. As a matter of fact, the persuasion of deferment has channeled and is keeping many persons in vital positions in the national economy and in activities essential to our critical scientific development.

This, then, is the overall picture of the present selective service operation—meeting the problems of today—anticipating and preparing for the problems of tomorrow and adaptable under a flexible law to the rapidly changing national and international conditions.

I cannot too strongly recommend that your committee favorably consider the President's request for a 4-year extension of this authority without modification.

Senator STENNIS. Thank you, General. The Chair has several questions here, but I am going to ask one briefly and then yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has business on the floor and is compelled to leave.

General, what are your personal views now on the fairness of requiring active reserve participation by inductees when the 6-month training program is not being operated to its full capacity or potential?

General HERSHEY. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I have always been very proud of having the Congress assume that I was an authority in every possible field. That is getting over into a field that's not directly in my responsibility.

I have not as much experience as I should in the operation of the 6-month program, although I did see last week several thousand of the individuals who are training out in one of our camps in the 6-month program alongside of the people that are not.

Now equity is a very peculiar thing. Equity is a thing we should always have, but you know the reason we induct people is so the rest of us can live, and we take the ones that we can use the best, and I think for the good of all it ought to be distributed as widely as it can be. I personally have always and do favor the 6-month program, and with my very limited observation I, of course, have been disturbed that there are not more people in it. But I have been disturbed about a great many other things in this country that have not been done to make us stronger. I am disturbed very much on our complacency, and yet I know you can't legislate either hysteria or even preparedness. I have felt that the reserves ought to be larger. One of the things that I have perhaps an advantage with over those who are responsible for these things is that I can give more consideration to the long-range look.

Now you see long- and short-range clash all the time. The Armed Forces have got to live today. Therefore, you must train a man as long as you can and keep him until he has senility come upon him. With my viewpoint I would like to see lots of people trained so that in this emergency that we have lived through a couple of times, we did not have to train them when we wanted them to fight. And the longer you train a man the less people you train. Now I am not going to get into which is right or which is wrong, but that is the basic thing that we are up against here. Are you going to train everybody a little or are you going to train a few a lot?

Senator STENNIS. You mentioned the things you were worrying about and this is one of them you said and you are getting right down to the point. We have two of these programs side by side, and here is one of them that is not being utilized and men want to get into it. I mean it is not being utilized to its potential of it. Then you turn around and require these other men to be subject to this reserve service. You say there is no such thing as absolute justice and absolute equity. Granting that, still as I understand it you think, your personal opinion is that this 6-month training program could well be further utilized, is that right?

General HERSHEY. I would like to see the 6-month program extended. I happen to be one of those who view with alarm the million or 2 million people we have who have never done anything, and I am now in the deferment business for almost everything. We defer a man if he does something that we think is going to help in our survival and take the man perhaps into the Armed Forces that is not giving any evidence he is doing something.

Therefore, I am in favor of getting more people who are doing nothing to doing something that will help survival. I do not have the breadth of opinion nor the responsibilities that the Armed Forces have, and therefore there might happen to be a little difference of

opinion between an aged soldier, if he ever was one, and the people who have the immediate responsibilities, which is not surprising.

Senator STENNIS. All right, I may come back to that. I yield to Senator Saltonstall.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just ask one question, General Hershey. You and I have been doing business since 1941 in Massachusetts and here. Now you make, in the last three sentences of your statement, the flat recommendation that the bill be extended, that this law be extended without amendment for 4 years. In your opinion over the years that you have been doing this job is that the fairest result that this committee can recommend to the Senate on the basis of every young man who is coming of age in this country?

General HERSHEY. Without the least reservation and remembering you either as Senator Saltonstall or Governor Saltonstall sitting by the fire up there in the capital, I would not say this if I had not given it the greatest thought. This question of modification, it is all very well to talk about that, but when you trade modification in a specific thing for the great thing you have in generality and flexibility, you are selling yourself short. This bill—I think in all fairness this committee should know that this bill—as you extend it is not the bill that you passed 4 years ago. Its implementation has gone far beyond what anyone who saw it would imagine during the time of Korea because this is a different time. Therefore, when you extend this bill, you are extending what we are doing now, not what we were doing 4 years ago.

Therefore, you can talk all you want about it. The words are the same but the implementation, with which you are perfectly familiar and with which you have gone along, and we are going to implement it some more in some other ways—the program that Dr. Berry just talked to you about, do you suppose 4 years ago that we would have thought we would have 3 or 4,000 in the residency program?

In fact you will remember 2 years ago I think this coming spring or perhaps it is 3 years ago there was a great deal of talk as to whether we dared take people into the Ready Reserve by direct enlistment if they are over 18½, but we did and nobody argues about whether it is legal.

It is a thing that we do, and yet there were people 3 years ago who said you can't do that. But this law is a much better law than sometimes I am afraid either the people outside or inside of Congress understand.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words it is a very broad law?

General HERSHEY. That is right.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And it's capable of the best possible interpretation by administrative agencies?

General HERSHEY. At the time that you need it.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STENNIS. Thank you, Senator Saltonstall.

Senator CASE?

Senator CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Hershey, the Scientific Manpower Commission representatives who were in here the other day, Dr. Meyerhoff and possibly some others, made some recommendations that scientific and technologically

trained men be assigned to civilian industry to fulfill their obligations. Did you happen to hear their testimony?

General HERSHEY. No, I did not hear the testimony. I just got in town quite late last night. However, I believe I am quite familiar with it because I had a conference within the last 2 or 3 weeks with Dr. Meyerhoff, and I think understand quite thoroughly his position.

Senator CASE. Would you comment upon their position or suggestion?

General HERSHEY. Yes. In the first place I don't think there is any doubt about the fact that we are heading toward a future in which I would not even presume to know what is service and what is not. The only thing I feel about the present recommendation which they have, I believe we are accomplishing everything except one which they want done. I don't think they are saying that we are taking the man out of industry. I think they are saying that he stays in there and then gets no credit for it. That is that after he has served 3 years, 4 years, 6 years, he still has an obligation which he will not give unless we are in an emergency, and if there is an emergency he is going to have to give it anyway.

Frankly, I may flatter myself to think that I understand the necessity of doing some of these things which the public has not yet arrived at the place where they are willing to give credit for deferment, and that is about what that amounts to.

Senator CASE. That is to give military credit for deferment?

General HERSHEY. That is right.

Senator CASE. In the particular occupation?

General HERSHEY. That is right, and what we are doing now, don't get me into figures as you know from long experience that I don't know anything about figures anyway.

Senator CASE. I am not sure about that.

General HERSHEY. We at the present time have 50,000 people that are being deferred for doing a variety of things in the industrial world that have to do with staying fit, that is making things. Now some of those are going to go up to 35 and never be taken, but they will have had the compulsion that kept them doing the things that they are doing, which we think are worthwhile, during that whole period. Now maybe it is not fair to keep them longer than you do the fellow who actually goes in, but that is a part of this balance. If you have a reasonably good job perhaps it is better to serve 10 or 12 years here rather than over here under less favorable circumstances. The only thing I think I would have any discussion with Dr. Meyerhoff and his group about is first of all I don't think we have set a pattern that we know whether it is 6 years or 12 years that we want to require a man to render service as a civilian in a scientific capacity. I believe that we will be able to do most everything he wants done except give the credit.

Personally I want to see how things work a little longer before I am quite ready to say that I want to settle for 6 years or 8 years or 10 years on a person who is a civilian and whom we are excepting.

One thing when we get to excepting, the first thing you know he is no longer working for one of these agencies. As soon as he has paid his debt he is off doing something else.

That is one of the difficulties we have. When we induct a scientist and he gets his service in then we can't say much about where he works after that.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest something to General Hershey which I don't want him to comment on.

Even though he says he has a deficiency officially I still would like some figures from him. I would like to suggest for your consideration the program that I will describe and have you give a reflective opinion on it.

The program would be to establish recognition for service in a scientific or approved occupation, and also to give recognition by way of reduction of Reserve liability for active duty service. If you can conceive of this in a table form, I would like to suggest this for the purpose merely of getting your evaluation of it. Ten years of Reserve liability if no military service and if in an approved technological or scientific duty approved by the Selective Service, 6 months of active duty plus 6½ years of Reserve liability for a total of 7 years of liability if only 6 months on active duty, 2 years of active duty plus 3 years of Reserve liability for a total of 5 years liability, 3 years of active duty plus 1 year of Reserve liability for a total of 4 years of liability, 3½ years of active service with no Reserve liability except in the case of general mobilization.

I would like your evaluation of that first with respect to the efficiency that might be expected of such a system or program; second, an evaluation as to the man-years of duty service that would be the result and, third, an evaluation of it in terms of costs.

Now if on the latter part, on costs, you think that is out of your field, I am going to ask the same thing of Mr. Finucane. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the same evaluation prepared by Mr. Finucane or his staff so that we can have it for possible consideration.

Senator STENNIS. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. The whole idea is to recognize that active duty might reduce reserve liability, and thereby seek to encourage longer term voluntary service.

General HERSHEY. Senator Case, you see what you immediately force us into. If I made up my mind and if a war should come tomorrow, I would rather have 10 men who had had 6 months' training than 1 man that had had 20 years' training. It is a question if you are trying to run an Armed Forces with the idea that there is never going to be a war, that is one thing.

If you are going to ever have to fight, 10 men with 6 months' training are certainly much better than 1 man with 20, and yet he has had him more times for training as they have.

The trouble is of course by that time he is about senile, and he is no longer physically able.

That is so. That is, one of the things we get into is running toward senility much more rapidly. I will do the best I can, but after all I will look at this problem as if we would have to fight tomorrow, and therefore the men who train for very long times are not going to be as valuable as three or four or five who have been trained for a lesser period of time but they are still available.

That is one of the difficulties.

Senator CASE. I don't know whether the Defense Department is agreeing with you or not.

General HERSHEY. I doubt it. In the first place there isn't near as much necessity of their agreeing with me as vice versa and there is not too much of vice versa. [Laughter.]

Senator CASE. In either event whatever system you use, under whatever program you might use the Defense Department would call upon you to provide the manpower that would meet the military requirements of a particular situation.

General HERSHEY. Sure, there is no question about it.

Senator CASE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STENNIS. General Hershey, I have a few questions here that I want to ask. One is with reference to this category of scientific and engineering services.

I want to be sure I understand you. You are experimenting with this now, is that what you said, with reference to letting these men go into the Reserve.

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir. I don't want to drag you back into history, but very hurriedly in World War I probably the medical student was about the only fellow that got deferred.

There are three reasons to defer. One is you defer because you can't take him. Secondly, you defer because he is doing something now that must be done. Three, you defer him because he is getting ready to do something that must be done.

That is where you get into the whole question of students, interns, and residents.

Now with World War II we deferred very liberally at the beginning of the war and much less than liberally at the end, but still the medical student and the student of dentistry was preserved in World War II.

Now during the Korean war there were several reasons but we have deferred very widely. We not only deferred the physician and the physician-to-be and the dentist and the dentist-to-be, but we deferred the engineer and the engineer-to-be and the scientist and the scientist-to-be, and to some extent teachers, especially in scientific and mathematical fields.

Now we have moved into where I don't want to say we are putting more emphasis on teachers than anything else, but we are. Since sputnik went up we have turned strongly to encourage people to go and teach, and the result is that we are experimenting all the time on what first of all the public can understand because we have got to sell local board members. They don't have to defer these people. They have to be sold but not told.

I think the tendency obviously is moving toward individuals who do things outside of the Armed Forces, but the question comes up always if you have an emergency, whether those things will be in a disciplined civilian community or whether you will have to revert to something approaching martial law in order to control it, and in either case you have got to try to train a person so that he has the skill. Secondly, you have got to somehow or other give him the discipline because you are going to have to have just as much discipline among civilians as you have among members of the Armed Forces.

I don't know whether that is what you are asking.

Senator STENNIS. That is along the lines with which I am concerned.

General HERSHEY. But we are deferring lots more kinds of people for two reasons. One the deed is not so great but you are trying to use the deferment on the one hand as the carrot and the induction as the whip if you want to call it that to keep the person channeled into scientific schools, into engineering schools, into medical schools, into now teaching. When I was a youngster it was a normal, now it is a school of education, but in any case it is making the person a teacher.

Senator STENNIS. In the age of technology you certainly have to extend beyond the concepts certainly even of the Korean wartimes. What I want to know is this: You feel that you are working it out under present law and present understanding of your local draft boards, and you don't need any legislation on it.

General HERSHEY. I don't think we do, and the individuals who came here, I think they would say we are doing fairly well, but obviously they would like to have credit. I don't think the public is quite ready to accept even these 10 years.

The only thing we have, and it is not a good thing to speak of, where we give credit for civilian service, but that happens to be in this very, very, very thin field over here of the conscientious objector.

Senator STENNIS. When you say give credit, are you talking about the 2 years of compulsory service or these years of Reserve liability?

General HERSHEY. In the first place the CO, of course, does 2 years and then that is all there is of it, but there is a lot of reasons for that will never enter into the other.

Now if we defer a person all of the time from 18½ clear up to 35, and there is going to be some of them that are going to be part of these figures that you are worrying Mr. Wool about. We have the theory that everybody serves.

The practice is going to be that the rare bird, if you want to call him that, is so useful that we keep the threat of service over him in order to keep him useful.

Senator STENNIS. If he is a physicist or a chemist or someone in electronics he should be excepted.

But you don't feel that you need any additional law on that subject.

General HERSHEY. We have tried many times to draft things and everything we have ever drafted we thought under any circumstances would be a hindrance rather than a help.

Senator STENNIS. Now, of those who go in, I have some young men, very intelligent young fellows too, and they are not asking for personal favors—they are graduate physicists and they give them something to do partly along this line.

I mean they are in the service. Then they have to do KP duty and everything. Now that is out of your category.

General HERSHEY. That is, but as an old soldier I'd be glad to comment on it.

Senator STENNIS. I want to know first how familiar are you with these practices?

General HERSHEY. I am familiar with those who were dissatisfied with the practices, but on the other hand I used to teach school and I found many students that did not have the same appreciation of

what grade I thought they ought to make than they did. Not only that, I have gone through life and I have had the greatest number of commanding officers that never realized the capacity that I had. I am a father of 4 children and I have 12 grandchildren and they don't think that I—I point out things that they say is beneath what ought to be done and I don't hardly dare to say this but I have to do things around our household that are not in accordance with my highest usability.

Senator STENNIS. I believe you might be referring to dishwashing.

General HERSHEY. And clothes washing too.

Senator STENNIS. I think we have thought here a serious matter. As I say, these young men apparently are very sincere. Some of them have already finished their tenure of duty, and I don't believe that this can be answered by just joking about it.

General HERSHEY. No, I don't, but on the other hand I know boys who go into industry, graduate engineers, and I happen to be a trustee of an engineering school, and after 5 years they tell me that they have not been used properly.

They have been kept at the drafting board or some other place, and that they were able to do a great many things. Now I take that with a certain amount of caution.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, will you yield to me?

Senator STENNIS. Yes, I yield to Senator Case.

Senator CASE. But General Hershey, I don't think that the illustrations you are using are wholly applicable. If there is one thing that distinguishes this country from the totalitarian countries, it is that we believe in the dignity of the individual, and we do not credit the state with the authority or the right to direct every individual's life, particularly after he reaches the age of consent, and I don't think that the position of a father with a child should be accepted as the norm for the government in relation to its citizens in a democracy.

General HERSHEY. I agree with you wholly, but are you going to except the man who is the head of an engineering department of any one of several firms I can mention to you? Are you going to let him tell these young fellows who think they have had 4 years of engineering and they think they can do quite a lot of things and they are doing simple drafting for 3 or 4 years, lots of them, and you know it as well as I do.

I am not trying to be facious about it at all. I think it is serious.

Senator CASE. But they do that as a voluntary matter.

General HERSHEY. All they have to do or they don't get their salary.

Senator CASE. They can take up some other occupation. They are not threatened with military service——

General HERSHEY. It is not as easy now as it was 2 years ago.

Senator CASE. If they don't follow the routine prescribed by their supervisor.

General HERSHEY. It is a job.

Senator STENNIS. The point I raise is not an individual matter there at all. It is not based on any individual. The subject is the proper use of our manpower.

General HERSHEY. That is right.

Senator STENNIS. That is what I am concerned about. This committee has no jurisdiction over industry. What are the services doing, during what Senator Case calls the compulsory period of training, to utilize this manpower without any favoritism at all?

General HERSHEY. I think we have seen a great deal of things published and put out by the services which indicates they are doing a great many things. But the point was that we have people who come back frustrated, and there is no question about it, but I am contending that frustration does not reside solely in the Armed Forces. Now for the reason that they try to restrict a person's life more than industry does, it is a sharper frustration, but yet as I had a soldier one time who told me he was not going to reenlist because he was going to be able to tell his boss certain things and I will not mention just how he was going to tell him, and he came back after he enlisted and I asked him why, because he is a good friend of mine and he said, "Well, I couldn't tell him those things and eat."

Now, this is not funny. It is a livelihood, and the tighter your economic situation is, the more a person has liberty but he does not dare exercise it.

Senator STENNIS. I get the impression from your testimony now that you more or less are agreeing that the services are not trying to utilize this training that these people have.

I want to know are you familiar with what the services are doing about it or trying to do about it, and if so, you are a qualified witness to talk about it. If you are not familiar with what they are doing, you are not an expert witness on that subject.

General HERSHEY. I am not an expert witness and I am not satisfied, but on the other hand I think they have gone in the last 10 years to remarkable degrees. I would say this, and I don't know that anybody asked me to say it, but I find a great deal of concern at the present time by people coming to me who have something to do with deferments on how they could exercise the kind of control they need over some of the civilians we have substituted.

Having been on a post within the last 24 hours and arriving at a certain place at 4 o'clock that is manned entirely by civilians, I have some idea of some of the things we used to use soldiers for, probably illegally after hours. But now we find ourselves restricted in what we are able to do because we get people on a very stated time, and the survival of this country goes on 24 hours a day.

Senator STENNIS. My concern is in the first place what are the services doing as to these men they have, and is there any legislation necessary, and if so what should it be?

That is my concern.

General HERSHEY. Then I had better disqualify myself I think, sir, because I don't know. I don't know of any law that I could in any conscience recommend to help them make use of these individuals, because there is quite a little difference between one person's idea of what they can do and another person's.

Senator STENNIS. I think they should have a lot of discretion in it and maybe I would be entirely satisfied with what they are doing, but maybe it should not be left to some commanding officer.

General HERSHEY. I talked with a commanding officer, of what happens to be a medical outfit, and his enthusiasm for the people that

he had was very reassuring to me. Now I did not talk to so many of the boys, although I did see a boy taking basic training the other day who had a master's degree, and obviously he probably would not have told me at that time he did not like it, but I do think that we are getting a very fine quality of individuals. Even when we used to have individuals who were not so high class, they were not always satisfied either with what we had them do.

It is quite a problem.

Senator STENNIS. I am sure it is a problem. Senator Case, do you have something further?

Senator CASE. Nothing more.

Senator STENNIS. I have one question here, General. Under the present procedures fathers are not deferred, with liability for induction until age 35, but they are placed in such a low priority for induction that they are not reached. Why would it not be desirable to defer fathers and thus extend their liability for induction instead of leaving them 1-A but not reaching them?

Does that follow the facts?

General HERSHEY. Not quite. In the first place, we have about 1,300,000 fathers that are deferred and their liability is extended. They are individuals who became fathers before a certain time, which had something to do with the issuing of the regulations, and they were individuals who presumably had no extreme hardship, and we have got approaching a million of those who are in 1-A, and if they never had been deferred before they became fathers they would have no extended liabilities. But if they go to school or any other thing this liability is extended even though they are now in 1-A because what determines whether they are extended or not is whether they ever have been deferred.

We have got around 1,400,000 fathers who are all deferred now and have been, and, of course, their liability is extended until they are 35 years of age. One of the things though is the time that these individuals became fathers. The ones who became fathers after the regulations were issued on it did not qualify, and we have carried them in a category now—a great many of them have been deferred by local boards on the basis that they are extreme hardship, but some of those considerations of extreme hardship, most of it has been mental because it would have been a little hard to prove extreme hardship from an economic standpoint.

But we have reduced the number of people that we had in the 1-A category of fathers rather materially during the past year, but I don't believe that it will completely disappear.

Senator STENNIS. All right, General Hershey, do you have some other point that you wish to bring up or discuss yourself?

General HERSHEY. No, sir.

Senator STENNIS. Senator Russell wanted to express his regrets to you and to Dr. Berry that he was compelled to be away during your testimony.

The Senator might have some questions he will submit to you in writing though I am not certain on that.

Secretary Finucane, I raised this point here about the men in the service. I am not informed on that. I just want to see if the Secretary wants to say a word on that point since I raised it.

Mr. FINUCANE. Is this the scientific personnel?

Senator STENNIS. Yes, the scientific personnel who are actually in the service.

Mr. FINUCANE. We have two programs for those people. Under one program they are given 3 months' active duty training and then they are put in the Standby Reserve for the balance of an 8-year military obligation.

Under the second program, when a 2-year inductee comes in who has some skill that is valuable to us, in his questionnaire he fills out his education and his general background, and we pick up all the people of special qualifications, of which we have many thousands, and they are immediately, after 8 weeks of basic training, placed in positions following their professions.

It is easily understandable Senator—that this only applies in the Army of course—that with our Chemical Corps, with our missile work at Redstone and the Ordnance work up here in Maryland and our various stations we have plenty of use for an almost unlimited number of fine minds, Senator.

Senator STENNIS. You have been talking about the man who came in, enlisted or was inducted by the selective service board.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. You have physicists, say, who you give 3 months' training I believe you said?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. And let them go out into industry?

Mr. FINUCANE. They go into civil life.

Senator STENNIS. Civil life?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. That is under certain supervision or restriction at least as to what they do I suppose?

Mr. FINUCANE. Only to the extent that they have the liability of remaining in the Standby Reserve.

Senator STENNIS. But they must follow their profession of course?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. And you always have the strings on them, as we say.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. And that is the Army program. Now, of course, the other two services are not now receiving anything except enlistees?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is correct, sir.

Senator STENNIS. We want to especially thank you.

Do you have something further, Senator Case?

Senator CASE. No.

Senator STENNIS. We want to also thank the Secretary, Dr. Berry, and General Hershey. There will be incorporated now in the record at this point statements submitted by Admiral Burke, General White, General Taylor, and General Pate.

(The documents referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF GENERAL MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

I appreciate the opportunity of expressing to this committee the Army's interest in the three very important and related legislative items under consideration by you today:

1. Extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.
2. Continuation of the Armed Forces at strengths above the limitations set by law.
3. Extension of the Dependent's Assistance Act.

The Army strongly supports this legislation and urges its passage as imperative to national security.

EXTENSION OF INDUCTION AUTHORITY

The Army is well satisfied with the Universal Military Training and Service Act as it is now written. We believe it to be the best instrument for meeting peacetime manpower requirements and at the same time insuring that our initial requirements will be met should we be required to mobilize. We further believe the administrative flexibility of the act is adequate to meet almost any set of conditions and that further amendment of the act is not desirable at this time. In my judgment, a 4-year extension of the act, rather than something shorter, is essential.

As I look at the future and consider the continuing manpower requirements of our national security, I do not foresee anything in the international situation which might suggest a significant reduction in requirements for military manpower below the levels which we now have.

To obtain the essential degree of coherence in military planning and to assure maximum stability for military programs, the Armed Forces and the Joint Chiefs of Staff must be able to project their overall personnel planning at least 4 years into the future. A shorter period of time would be at variance with other lead time planning factors and would therefore be of limited value.

Moreover, I would say that in the present international climate any reduction in the length of time of the draft extension legislation might be interpreted by our allies as a sign of indecision and weakness. On the other hand, a 4-year extension would serve to reassure our friends that we mean business in maintaining our military readiness. It would also indicate to the Soviet bloc that our determination to resist aggression remains constant and would present visible evidence of such determination in contribution to our overall deterrent posture.

An additional point worthy of consideration is the stabilizing effect of a 4-year extension upon the career planning of the young men who are eligible for induction. They are entitled to clear guidance projected as far as possible into the future in order to make timely provision for the possibility of military service.

Since 1948 over 2,300,000 men have been provided by the Selective Service System for induction into the Army. The authority to induct has, in itself, been a stimulus for voluntary enlistments into the Army as well as our sister services.

The Active Army requires a strength of 870,000 men for the end of fiscal year 1959 in order to support a 14-division force, with 8 divisions deployed overseas, and 6 in the Continental United States. The exact strength of the Army which could be supported without induction authority is difficult to predict. However, experience gained just prior to Korea in trying to maintain the strength of the Army without induction as well as current studies of probable maximum levels of volunteering convince me that it is impossible to support the Army required without selective service. In reaching this conclusion, full consideration has been given to the beneficial effects of the new pay bill and related actions. They have all been most helpful in improving the quality of Army personnel but in combination are no replacement for the selective service law.

In this connection I would like to express the appreciation of the Army for the previous help of this committee in securing the important legislation which has given us the means to improve the quality of Army personnel. I am happy to report that the elimination of marginal personnel with limited potential and the raising of induction standards authorized by the 85th Congress have resulted in the closing of three of our five disciplinary barracks and in establishing a record of conduct within the Army at the highest level I have known in my service.

The Army's officer procurement programs benefit to varying degrees from the stimulus of induction. Thus, the selective service law permits us to meet our quantitative officer requirements and maintain a high degree of selectivity. Many of the college students who enroll in ROTC are influenced by their deferred draft status to seek the opportunity to discharge their military obligation as an officer. In addition, many of our officer candidates are inductees; loss of

induction authority would reduce procurement from these major sources of officer procurement.

The draft law stimulates enlistments in the Reserve components. In addition, it provides a steady flow from the Active Army into the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard of individuals who have a Reserve obligation to discharge. These sources of Reserve manpower would be adversely affected by loss of induction authority and the mobilization readiness of the Reserve components could be seriously impaired.

In addition to an adequate Active and Reserve Force in being, a fundamental part of our national security posture is our mobilization readiness. Current Army mobilization plans are based in part on the existence of induction authority and an operating Selective Service System on M-Day. Should induction authority be lost, the selective service machinery would tend to disintegrate and its loss would greatly increase the time necessary to obtain sufficient inductees in a national emergency. Without a functioning Selective Service System, early and effective mobilization would be difficult to achieve, and our ability to react rapidly could be seriously impaired.

CONTINUATION OF THE ARMY AT A STRENGTH ABOVE THE LIMITATIONS SET BY LAW

At present the Active Army strength is about 890,000. The law limits us to an active strength of 837,000. In the past the Congress has recognized the necessity of suspending the legal ceiling in the interest of national security. Tense world conditions requiring discharge of our heavy international responsibilities make it impossible to consider reducing the Army to the strength authorized by law at this time.

DEPENDENTS' ASSISTANCE ACT

I would like briefly to cover our need for extension of the Dependent's Assistance Act. This act supplements the pay of the enlisted man, including the inductee, who has dependents and is designed for the sole purpose of providing a reasonable living standard for his family. I consider it as a necessary corollary to the draft. The base pay and allowances of an enlisted man, especially in the lower grades, are not adequate to support a family and must be supplemented. Expiration of this act would result in severe hardship to service families, adversely affect morale, and decrease voluntary enlistments and reenlistments.

In summary, the Army strongly supports favorable action by the Congress on these three legislative proposals.

STATEMENT BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, USN, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome the opportunity to submit for your consideration the Navy's position with respect to H.R. 2260. This bill, if enacted into law, will extend until July 1, 1963, the authority to induct persons into active training and service in the armed services, and to make special calls for persons in medical, dental, and allied specialist categories. It will extend also, for the same period, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, relating to the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950. The Navy strongly supports and recommends enactment of H.R. 2260.

Admiral Russell, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, in appearing before the House Committee on Armed Services, outlined in some detail the Navy's position with respect to the provisions of this proposed legislation; therefore I will not burden the members of this committee with a repetition of his statement.

Admiral Russell has testified that without the influence of the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service Act there would be a definite reduction in the quality of our volunteers. Likewise, without this influence there is serious doubt that our strength requirements could be met. The effect upon the Naval Ready Reserve under these circumstances and without the 6-year obligation would be even more severe. He further stated that this act stimulates many individuals to enter the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps and other officer-procurement programs, which are the primary source for meeting our current active duty requirements for junior officer personnel. In these statements I heartily concur. In further support of this legislation, I

would like to reemphasize the Navy's position that the extension be for a period of 4 years, or until July 1, 1963, as it now appears before you in H.R. 2260. It is my conviction that any lessening of the period of extension would be a grave error.

On the international scene we must make it abundantly clear that there has been no lessening of our determination to maintain a military posture which will insure the security of our Nation. Since the Congress in the past has seen fit to extend the draft legislation for periods of 4 years, any lessening of this period might well be taken as a sign of weakening determination.

Of equal importance is the psychological effect upon the youth of our Nation in their planning for their future. The United States of America has achieved its greatness over the years through the determination of our forebears, at whatever expense, to maintain our ideals of democracy and security. We must make it clear to the young men of today and the future that they have an obligation to their country.

And finally, but of course an almost insignificant advantage in comparison with the points I have briefly mentioned above, a 4-year extension certainly makes administration of personnel, long-range planning of procurement programs, and operation and maintenance of support establishments such as training stations more effective and economical.

The provisions of this bill relating to the extension of the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, suspension of authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, go hand in hand with the requirements for the extension of the draft provisions in that world conditions require the maintenance of our Armed Forces in strengths beyond that contemplated under true peacetime conditions.

Finally, I am sure that the distinguished members of this committee will agree that as long as we are forced to draft young men into the services or to use a draft law to encourage voluntary enlistments, we have a responsibility toward these young men and their dependents. The Congress has recognized this responsibility in the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950, and its concurrent extension is strongly recommended.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL THOMAS D. WHITE, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my purpose in making this presentation is to express the unqualified support of the Department of the Air Force to the Department of Defense request for the extension of three provisions of law. These are:

The induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces, and

The Dependents Assistance Act.

These will be discussed in order.

As you gentlemen know, the Air Force does not use the draft as a direct means of procuring its military personnel. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the quantitative degree to which the draft assists the Air Force in meeting its annual personnel procurement objectives. The draft does, however, have an indirect but very beneficial effect on the various personnel procurement programs of the Air Force. The very fact of its existence causes many men to enlist in the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, or to enter the Air Force Reserve Officer Training program in preference to being drafted. This is particularly true in the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard enlistment programs. This stimulus is most beneficial to the Air Force also in meeting its qualitative active duty requirements; we are able to exercise greater selectivity in our enlistment program than would be possible without the existence of the draft. Likewise, the draft forms a similar stimulus for the Air Force ROTC program, influencing enrollment of many youths who desire to fulfill their military obligation as Air Force officers. Once in this program, we then select those who meet the required standards and endeavor to interest these individuals in selecting the Air Force for a career. I feel that it is pertinent to add here that the Air Force ROTC program is the major source of officer procurement in the Air Force. It has also been apparent that without the draft it is not possible to meet the minimum requirement for doctors and

dentists. For these reasons, it is considered essential that the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act be extended as proposed in the bill now under consideration.

The second provision under discussion is equally important. We consider it imperative that the authority to suspend the restriction on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces be extended. Failure to extend this authority would result in the release without replacement of several hundred thousand military personnel in the Armed Forces. For example, the Air Force alone would be required to reduce its military strength by approximately 350,000 personnel—over 40 percent. I know I do not have to describe for you the drastic effect that such a reduction would have on the combat capability of the Air Force and on its ability to meet its current and programed commitments.

The current and programed strengths of the individual services are based upon a minimum military capability required to support our national policy and worldwide commitments. Any appreciable strength reductions—much less that of large scale decreases which would result if this provision were not extended—would substantially reduce the ability of the services to fulfill these requirements. Several times in the past, Congress has recognized the necessity to extend the suspension of the Armed Forces military personnel authorization restriction. It is urgently requested that favorable consideration be given once again to the extension of this provision of law.

The last item under discussion today, the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act, is now a greater requirement than it was at the time that you gentlemen first approved the provisions of the current law. If this act were not to be extended at this time, the beneficial effects of last year's pay bill as pertains to a large segment of the enlisted members of the services, would be almost negated. In addition to detracting from the incentive for individuals to enlist for duty in one of the services, curtailment of the increased quarters allowances which were provided by this act would deal a powerful blow to the morale of the entire enlisted population affected by such a change. There is no doubt that the termination of this legislation would be followed at the earliest opportunity by a large exodus of the very enlisted personnel that the services need so badly and are attempting to retain. It would be impossible for a large number of enlisted personnel to support their dependents adequately if this act were not extended. Your support on this matter is urgently required.

I would like to inject this thought in closing. The survival of this Nation is not solely dependent upon superior technology and equipment. It is equally—or possibly to an even greater degree—dependent upon the caliber and incentive of the personnel who are behind this technology and who must operate this equipment. Each one of the items under consideration today has a vital and direct bearing on our ability to perform our assigned mission. Your support of the extension of the provisions I have discussed will provide means to obtain and retain the type of personnel we need to accomplish the tremendous tasks which lie ahead. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS

I have reviewed the proposed legislative program and will comment on each item separately. Although the Marine Corps is a volunteer organization, extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is essential to its manpower program. The draft authority motivates many persons to enlist or enter programs leading to a commission in the Marine Corps, and enhances the quality in each of these categories. In addition, the Marine Corps has a 6-month training program which has been instrumental in maintaining our Ready Reserve effectiveness. If there were no draft, enlistments in this program would probably drop to a point where the program would be jeopardized. Thus, every aspect of procurement, officer and enlisted, Regular and Reserve, would be adversely affected unless the draft is extended.

If the Dependents Assistance Act is not extended, about 20,000 Marines in the lower pay grades with dependents will lose their basic quarters allowance, and all enlisted personnel in the higher pay grades with dependents will lose from about \$10 to \$30 contingent upon the size of the family. This severe monetary loss would, in effect, constitute a reduction in an accepted standard of pay. This benefit is also important in view of our efforts to stabilize and improve the quality of our enlisted personnel by increased retention rates.

The extension of the authority to suspend strength ceilings would have no effect on the Marine Corps since we are far below the ceiling authorized. Therefore, no comment is submitted on this point.

Senator STENNIS. The committee has received requests from several organizations that statements reflecting their views be inserted in the record. These statements are hereby made a part of the record at this point.

(The statements referred to follow :)

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Chicago, Ill., March 2, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RUSSELL: The purpose of this letter is to submit for the consideration of the Committee on Armed Services the position of the American Medical Association on H.R. 2260, 86th Congress, a bill, which, in part, would extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

With respect to the extension of the special provisions of this act applicable to medical, dental, or allied specialists, the American Medical Association wishes to reaffirm its position which was outlined in testimony presented in 1957, on the bill which subsequently was enacted as Public Law 85-62, approved June 27, 1957. At that time, the association testified that, " * * * if the demands for the defense and security of our Nation are such that, in the opinion of Congress, it is necessary to have a draft act to maintain the strength of our Armed Forces, then the extension of the present legislation would be one method to insure sufficient physicians for the military services."

The association also recommended retention of the provisions of the law relating to the national, State, and local committees which advise the Selective Service System in regard to the selection of medical, dental, and allied specialists required by the services. These advisory committees consider, among other factors, the needs of the civilian population in the communities from which these physicians would be taken. The association is pleased that this provision is a part of the current law.

In regard to specialist categories, the association recommends, as it did previously in May 1957, that the word "other" should be substituted for the word "allied" in this section of the law. This would authorize a selective call for other specialists, such as engineers, physicists, other scientists, et cetera, which might be needed by the military forces. Presently, the law provides only for the selective callup of medical, dental, or "allied" specialists.

The association believes that physicians should be registered and classified in the same manner as other citizens in the same age group, deferred for educational purposes in the same manner as other registrants and called to active duty or inducted under the same general provisions as other registrants deferred for educational purposes.

It is noted that the pending bill proposes a 4-year rather than a 2-year extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. We believe the additional 2-year extension of time should be fully explained and justified to the committee. We believe that this justification is necessary because scientific and technological advances have resulted in rapidly changing concepts of military manpower requirements. Consequently, there has resulted, directly or indirectly, current and projected reductions in the strength of the Armed Forces. It is conceivable that future manpower requirements may be subject to further downward revisions. A 2-year extension of the law would permit a timely review of military manpower requirements in light of pertinent changes in the then current military situations. The association believes that this would be particularly desirable with respect to the callup of medical and allied specialists because of the increasing demands and requirements of the civilian population for the Nation's medical and health resources.

As you know from our previous appearances before your committee, the association has had a keen and sustained interest in military medicine for many years. Through the Surgeons General of the military services, we have maintained a friendly and close working arrangement in the consideration and ad-

vancement of military medical affairs. We feel that the health of the Nation requires a careful correlation of military and civilian medicine. In furtherance of this objective, the association, working with the military services, has attempted to insure improvement in the utilization of medical manpower by the armed services and a strengthening of the career incentive program for medical officers.

On behalf of the American Medical Association, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to present our views on H.R. 2260 and to assure your committee of our willingness to continue our assistance in providing the members of the military services with the finest medical care.

Yours sincerely,

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 10, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: There is submitted for the files of the Senate Armed Services Committee a statement setting forth the official position of the American Dental Association on the extension of the special registration provisions for dentists and physicians under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. These provisions are commonly known as the doctor-draft law.

I would appreciate it if you would have this material included in the record of the hearings on H.R. 2260, a bill to extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act until June 30, 1963.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CREIG, D.D.S.,
Chairman, Council on Legislation.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

On H.R. 2260, 86th Congress, Extending Until June 30, 1963, the Special Provisions for Inducting Dentists and Physicians Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act

The American Dental Association has no objection to continuing the existing provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which permit special calls for nonveteran dentists under the age of 35 years. The association's position, however, is based upon the following assumptions: (1) That the provisions permitting special calls for dentists are, as the Department of Defense has indicated, necessary to assure an adequate staff of military dental officers, and (2) that the regular draft provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act will also be extended until June 30, 1963.

The House of Delegates of the American Dental Association, the association's policy-making body, adopted the following resolution at its November 1958 annual session:

"Resolved, That the American Dental Association believes that the following considerations should be treated in any legislation under the terms of which members of the dental profession can be involuntarily ordered into military service:

"1. Liability for military service should apply only to dentists otherwise liable as regular registrants under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"2. The obligated period of service should not exceed that imposed upon persons inducted as regular registrants under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"3. Dentists should not be inducted for any purpose other than to satisfy the officer personnel requirements of the military dental corps.

"4. The rank and pay system for dental officers should not be below the present level.

"5. The national, State and local advisory committees should be retained and their authority in no way diminished.

"6. The students pursuing a course in predental or dental training at colleges and universities in the United States should be deferred from induction until completion of such training."

REVIEW OF AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION'S POSITION ON SPECIAL DENTIST DRAFT REQUIREMENTS

The American Dental Association has since 1950 maintained an exceptional policy position on the special requirements for inducting dentists into military service. In 1950 the association recognized that the regular system for registering and inducting persons into military service during an emergency might not be a suitable device for obtaining the dental officers needed to staff the military dental corps. The association also recognized that to staff the military dental corps adequately at that time would require more dentists than could be obtained from the age groups then liable for induction. This situation prevailed until 1955. In that year the number of recent dental school graduates liable under the regular draft law was sufficient for military dental corps replacement needs.

At the 1955 hearings on extending the so-called doctor draft law the association urged Congress to amend the law so that only nonveteran dentists who had a basic liability under the regular draft could be called—in effect nonveteran dentists under the age of 35. Congress did not grant this request but did lower the age for doctor-draft liability from 51 to 45 years. In 1957 Congress amended the law to confine special calls to nonveteran dentists and physicians under age 35.

It is also of interest to note (1) that there has been no need for a special call by selective service for dentists since 1955, and (2) that in each year since 1955 the military has not been able to bring to active duty all of the dental school graduates who applied for commissions. This has been to a large extent the result of the excellent system sponsored jointly by the association and the Department of Defense for screening and selecting the senior dental student applicants well in advance of their graduation date.

CURRENT ESTIMATES OF RESOURCES AND NEEDS

According to the most recent survey of the dental schools' senior classes, there are 2,015 senior students liable for military service and eligible for allocation to the three Armed Forces. The 3 Dental Corps will need about 1,500 replacements for fiscal year 1960.

EFFECT OF THE 6-MONTH TRAINING PROGRAM OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

At the hearing before the House Armed Services Committee in extending the special dentist-physician provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act in May of 1957, Representative Brooks inquired as to whether a substantial number of future dental and medical students might satisfy their military liability by participating in the 6-month active duty and Reserve program before entering dental or medical school. The association has recently surveyed the dental schools to determine how many students had participated in the 6-month active duty program before entering dental school. The results, though not yet complete, indicate that this program will have no significant impact upon the number of future nonveteran dental graduates available for service as dental officers after graduation. The results of the survey are as follows: As of January 28, 24 of the 47 dental schools had reported. Out of a total enrollment of 6,806 students in the 24 schools reporting, only 25 had fulfilled their military liability through the 6-month program.

SUMMARY

The American Dental Association has no objection to continuing until June 30, 1963, the existing special provisions for calling dentists into military service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. The association's position is based upon the assumptions that the regular draft provisions of the Universal Military Training Act will be continued until June 30, 1963, and that the Department of Defense will need the special call authority to staff the Dental Corps adequately and to assure continued high standards of dental care for members of the Armed Forces.

Submitted by:

RALPH E. CREIG, D.D.S.,
Chairman, Council on Legislation, American Dental Association.

AMERICAN LEGION,
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Referring to the hearings now being held by the Senate Armed Services Committee on H.R. 2260 to extend the Draft Act until July 1, 1963, I enclose several copies of a statement by Mr. William C. Doyle, chairman, Military Affairs Committee, the American Legion, in support of said bill.

While we are not asking for the privilege of a personal appearance before the committee by Mr. Doyle, I respectfully request that copies of his statement be given to the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and also incorporated in the record of the hearings.

Thanking you for your courtesy, and with kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

MILES D. KENNEDY, *Director.*

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM DOYLE, CHAIRMAN, MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, these are days of crisis.

The American Legion believes that in the interest of our national security the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be extended by the Congress to July 1, 1963.

My purpose in appearing before this committee today is to express the mandate of the American Legion on the subject of the power to induct, or, as it is better known, the draft.

The recommendation of the American Legion is based upon the following resolution, adopted by the 1958 National Convention of the American Legion:

"RESOLUTION NO. 305. Extension of induction authority under Universal Military Training and Service Act to July 1, 1963

"Whereas, section 17(C) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferments under section 6 of such act have ceased to exist; and

"Whereas, selective service is based on the accepted principle of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation; and

"Whereas, the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every young man to serve his country in a military capacity; and

"Whereas, the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefore under the aforesaid act is essential to insure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces since voluntary enlistments in such forces and their reserve components are greatly stimulated and influenced by the mere existence of that induction authority; and

"Whereas, the existence of full induction authority enables the Selective Service System to (1) insure that the required strength of the active Armed Forces be maintained both directly by inductions and indirectly by stimulating enlistments; (2) to assist in maintaining the required strength of the Reserve forces by deferring inductions of members who serve satisfactorily, and (3) by classifications deferring induction, to channel men possessing critical skills or the requisite ability to acquire them into essential activities and occupations including engineering, scientific and technical pursuits, and teaching, and the study and preparation for such fields; and

"Whereas, the Selective Service System maintains through registration, an inventory of all men of military age, including the only inventory of veterans no longer in the Armed Forces, who in an emergency might be needed quickly for augmentation of those forces, and keeps current the availability for order to active duty in time of emergency of over a million members of the Standby Reserve; and

"Whereas, selective service has become an integral part of the Nation's defense and the Selective Service System, by its decentralized system of operation through over 4,000 local and appeal boards in every community made up of

local citizens, has earned and enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people; and

"Whereas, the local boards of the Selective Service System in every community of this Nation would render invaluable service in the event of an all-out emergency because of their ability to furnish manpower at local levels to any agency authorized to requisition men for specific duties; and

"Whereas, some 40,000 of the 46,000 full- and part-time officers and employees of the Selective Service System have volunteered their services to the Government and receive no compensation; and

"Whereas, the annual cost of operating the Selective Service System is only about 16 cents for every man, woman, and child in this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Chicago, Ill., September 1-4, 1958, That section 17(C) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, be further amended so that all authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963, and that the American Legion use all of its efforts and influence to this end."

Mr. Chairman, the bill upon which this distinguished committee now holds hearings has already passed the House of Representatives. Indirectly, Senators have cited the need for this bill on the floor. I mean that within the past weeks, since the Berlin crisis began to flare anew, a number of Senators have expressed concern over the role of the United States in this area.

There has been talk on the floor of the U.S. Senate of preparing to meet an emergency. On May 27, the Soviet Union will turn over to Communist East Germany the control of all traffic into Berlin and over all traffic between the Soviet sector and the Western sector within Berlin.

In the face of this crisis and other existing tension spots around the world, it is almost inconceivable that the apparatus for inducting young men into the Armed Forces should be abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, according to figures provided the American Legion, it costs each citizen but approximately 15 cents a year to operate the Selective Service System. Savings made in the abolishment for this system would not be in the best interest of the American people, it is the opinion of the American Legion.

Then too, I would direct the attention of this distinguished committee to this point. Under the present setup of the Selective Service System, an accurate, up-to-date record file of all young men eligible under present law for the draft is maintained. The vast majority of the people who maintain these records, and serve on local boards are volunteers. These people have an intimate knowledge, especially in small communities, of the status of their townsfolk.

If war comes as it has been pictured, in the form of a sudden, paralyzing attack, the knowledge of these people of their local situations would be of immeasurable aid to our war effort. This would be especially true if an attack came to Washington, D.C., for instance.

The American Legion submits this question to Congress. If war were to come to our beloved country, could we afford not to have in operation the Selective Service System with the power to induct?

Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that the American Legion during its 40 years of service to God and country has supported universal training for the young men of the United States as a means of maintaining an alert reservoir of trained men to fight for the ideals of our great Nation. Time proved the value of the American Legion's position. Three times in the space of two generations immediate mobilization of our fighting strength has been necessitated to preserve our way of life.

We have, in fact, no reason to believe that another immediate mobilization will not be necessitated in the future.

On September 13, 1958, Gen. Maxwell Taylor pointed out, in a speech to the U.S. Conference of Mayors: "We are facing a long period of tension wherein our national military posture must be maintained, even at great effort. We have assumed responsibilities as a nation which we cannot put down * * *."

In the face of Communist imperialism, it is the feeling of the American Legion that a most important part of our military posture is the training of our young men. Earlier this month, Charles C. Finucane, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, came before a House committee to request an extension of 4 years for the draft.

Mr. Finucane said all branches of service had a firm objective of filling manpower needs by voluntary means. But despite this objective, Mr. Finucane said, the Army needs to draft men to maintain its full authorized strength.

Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that the documented information from the archives, preserved for future generations by historians of the past, reveals, from Civil War days to the present time, that without some form of compulsory induction our Armed Forces have not been able to maintain their required strength. It is said that many of the young men who enlist in various branches of the service do so because of the existence of selective service.

In World War I, 3½ months elapsed between the passage of the act of May 18, 1917, and the induction of the first man; and about 4½ months elapsed before the System supplied men in substantial numbers.

The slogan of World War I was that we "fought the war to end all wars." In 1939, however, we started construction of war plants in preparation for World War II. Then in 1940, came the first peacetime draft, inducting men for 1 year, but most of them stayed for the "duration plus," because of World War II.

Under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, 2 months and 2 days was required from the time the act was signed until the first man was inducted on November 18, 1940.

Fortunately for the United States, Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Thousands of men were already in training at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Otherwise, this Nation would have been thrown into World War II totally unprepared.

The President recommended on March 3, 1947, that the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 be allowed to expire on March 31, 1947. Within a year the President requested Congress to reenact the law.

During that year, the Armed Forces with all-out recruiting and many inducements and professional campaigns succeeded in raising and maintaining the largest voluntary force in the Nation's history. Even so, this force numbered only 1,384,500 men. Early in 1948 it became apparent that a force of at least 2,005,882 men was needed for minimum defense of our Nation.

In considering the 1948 act, the House Armed Services Committee noted that the Navy and Air Force could maintain their March 1948 strength by voluntary means; the Army could not.

When the Secretary of Defense appeared in 1948 before the House Committee on Armed Services, he said:

"* * * Viewing the bill from the standpoint of national security as a whole, the simple fact is that we must have selective service * * *."

Mr. Chairman, the American Legion respectfully submits that the overall situation has not changed since that time, except perhaps to grow worse. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower has just stated in essence that the same situation now exists with respect to recruitment.

So, after a year of attempting to do without a selective service law, the Congress and the Nation came to realize that we could no better afford to be without selective service in a time of cold war than in a time of hot war. The threat which prompted the enactment of the law in 1948 was at that time just emerging. Few would argue that the world is a more secure place today than it was in March of 1948.

The nature of the threat presently precludes any or little warning in case of nuclear attack. In the event war comes as it is often pictured, a widespread nuclear attack without warning, the Nation's legislative processes very likely would be paralyzed and the authorization of a manpower procurement system would be hampered and delayed.

It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that as a byproduct of World War II and the Korean war, we have in the United States some 22,700,000 veterans. Some people argue that this provides an adequate reservoir of trained men.

What these people overlook is the fact that over 13 million of them are over 36 years of age.

Mr. Chairman, military experts have come since hearings began in the 86th Congress to plead the case of an extended draft law.

The American Legion is grateful to this distinguished committee for this opportunity to express the views of its members, and we respectfully recommend that the Congress extend the power to induct to July 1, 1963, as set forth in H.R. 2260.

**STATEMENT OF COL. JOHN T. CARLTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES**

Re H.R. 2260, a bill to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, thank you for the opportunity of appearing before this committee in behalf of this bill, to extend for 4 years the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

We are especially pleased to support this legislation, and it is our hope that it will be extended without delay. We consider it highly important to national security.

Mr. Chairman, the Reserve Officers Association represents the majority of the officers of all services in the United States—Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and Coast Guard, including the Active Duty Forces—where reservists constitute a majority of the officers. Representatives of these various elements, at ROA's national convention in June 1958, adopted a resolution supporting this bill. I should like to ask permission at this point to include as a part of this statement this resolution.

It is our opinion that there is no really debatable issue surrounding this bill. The witnesses from the various services have made adequately clear the reasons for submission of the extension proposal. We endorse substantially the clear and compelling statements which they have made.

We believe that most Americans will recognize the soundness and logic of the arguments which have been made. To seek to add to, or belabor, these points would be more like an attempt to gild the lily.

One aspect, however, we would like to reemphasize: The law itself has served to strengthen the recognition of every citizen's obligation to military service, and in that recognition has strengthened our Nation for any future emergency. This, of course, is far from enough to insure the Nation's safety, but it does set the stage and establish the spirit which will move the people of this country to meaningful and effective service when dangers arise.

What this bill seeks is to retain the system which is working fairly today. We hope this committee will see fit to continue it in effect.

**"EXTENSION OF INDUCTION AUTHORITY UNDER UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING
AND SERVICE ACT TO JULY 1, 1963**

"Whereas section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferments under section 6 of such act have ceased to exist; and

"Whereas selective service is based on the accepted principle of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation; and

"Whereas the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every man to serve his country in a military capacity; and

"Whereas the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefor under the aforesaid act is essential to ensure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in annual convention assembled at Atlantic City, N.J., this 27th day of June 1958, that:

"(1) Section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, be further amended so that all the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963; and

"(2) That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States use all of its efforts and influence to this end."

Approved by the national convention at Atlantic City, N.J., June 27, 1958.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1959.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: It is with pleasure that the Disabled American Veterans endorses H.R. 2260, a bill to extend the provisions of the Universal Military Training Act to July 1, 1963, which proposed legislation is to receive the consideration of your committee on March 3, 1959.

In the above connection please find enclosed a copy of Resolution No. 61 on the subject, as adopted by the 1958 national convention of this organization. The speedy action of the House and now of the Senate in expediting this piece of "must" legislation is most gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER M. FREUDENBERGER,
Acting National Director of Legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. 61 OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Whereas section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625) as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferments under section 6 of such act have ceased to exist; and

Whereas selective service is based on the accepted principles of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation; and

Whereas the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every man to serve his country in a military capacity; and

Whereas the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefor under the aforesaid act is essential to insure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces since voluntary enlistments in such forces and their Reserve components are greatly stimulated and influenced by the mere existences of that induction authority; and

Whereas the existence of full induction authority enables the Selective Service System (1) to insure that the required strength of the active Armed Forces be maintained both directly by inductions and indirectly by stimulating enlistments, (2) to assist in maintaining the required strength of the Reserve forces by deferring inductions of members who serve satisfactorily, and (3) by classifications deferring induction, to channel men possessing critical skills or the requisite ability to acquire them into essential activities and occupations including engineering, scientific and technical pursuits and teaching, and the study and preparation for such fields; and

Whereas the Selective Service System maintains through registration an inventory of all men of military age including the only inventory of veterans no longer in the Armed Forces who, in an emergency, might be needed quickly for augmentation of those forces, and keeps current the availability for order to active duty in time of emergency of over a million members of the Standby Reserve; and

Whereas selective service has become an integral part of the Nation's defense and the Selective Service System, by its decentralized system of operation through over 4,000 local and appeal boards in every community made up of local citizens, has earned and enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people; and

Whereas the local boards of the Selective Service System in every community of this Nation would render invaluable service in the event of an all-out emergency because of their ability to furnish manpower at local levels to an agency authorized to requisition men for specific duties; and

Whereas some 40,000 of the 46,000 full- and part-time officers and employees of the Selective Service System have volunteered their services to the Government and receive no compensation; and

Whereas the annual cost of operating the Selective Service System is only about 16 cents for every man, woman, and child in this Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans in convention assembled in Louisville, Ky., That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, be further amended so that all the

authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL GRANGE

Washington, D.C., February 26, 1959.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since the National Grange finds it impossible to appear before your committee next week to testify concerning the extension of the Universal Military Training Act, we are presenting a summary of our policies in this field by letter—hoping that this letter may become a part of the hearing record.

During a period of world tension, such as exists at the present time, when it appears that this tension will continue for a long period of time, and, when an adequate Military Establishment is of paramount importance for the safety of the country, it is the position of the National Grange that the manpower to staff this establishment should be recruited and maintained—not by compulsion but through a system of adequate incentives.

The present “universal” draft law materially infringes on several individual liberties specifically protected by the Constitution. These same liberties, on the other hand, would be placed in jeopardy without an adequate defense structure.

In our opinion, however, it is time to begin to develop a system of manning our Defense Establishment in a manner in harmony, instead of in violation, with the several provisions of the Constitution of the United States that are now being flaunted.

Is not now the time to develop for future passage by Congress, say, 2 years away, a plan to man the military by paying enough (plus adequate other benefits) to attract, train, and hold the type men needed in sufficient numbers?

The argument that this would be unduly expensive and that the United States cannot afford it is not valid; indeed, it hints that we are justified in infringing upon human liberties in violation of the provisions of our Constitution whenever it is less costly than honoring these Constitutional guaranties.

There are many other reasons why peacetime compulsory military service—whether it be universal or selective in nature—falls far short of being a satisfactory system.

We do not now have “universal” training. More than one-half of all young men will never see any military service under the present application of the law.

Furthermore, we do not need and cannot purposefully use all eligible manpower in the armed services under present conditions.

Is it not, therefore, a serious mistake to attempt to now justify the theory of universality of service based on the argument that all young men have an obligation to serve in the Armed Forces?

Without proper incentives it is next to impossible to meet today's highly technical, highly trained defense manpower needs, with the result that our present situation is not only inadequate and inefficient but is frightfully expensive.

In fact, the loss of trained technical personnel in which our Defense Establishment has very high investment is an extravagance that should be halted.

It is our hope that you and the members of your committee will see fit to recommend to the Senate that it authorize an extension of the present Act for only 2 years, during which time the Congress would have time to develop a more satisfactory system based on adequate incentives instead of compulsion; and also upon the sound principle of training and retaining the kind of personnel that our maximum defense posture requires.

The official position of the National Grange, as it relates to incentives versus compulsion, is spelled out on page 163 of the journal of proceedings of the 91st annual session of our delegate body at Colorado Springs, Colo., in November of 1957. This statement reads as follows:

“In view of the tension prevailing in world affairs and the probability that the United States will need to maintain a substantial, well-trained defense organization for a great many years, we favor improved incentives and pay increases for scientifically trained and highly specialized personnel, such as pilots

and engineers, thereby providing a more stable experienced and effective military force at less ultimate cost to the Nation."

At the 1958 convention held in Grand Rapids, Mich., last November, this resolution was passed by the delegate body, reaffirming previous and long-standing Grange support of adequate incentives in achieving and maintaining a proper defense posture, rather than to continue to rely indefinitely on the universal military training approach.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM, *Master.*

MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. Herbert S. Atkinson.)

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I have the honor to transmit to you the enclosed statement of the chairman of the legislative committee of the Military Order of the World Wars regarding the extension of the U.M.T. and S. Act, H.R. 2260.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE REITH,
Rear Admiral, USNR (Retired),
Secretary General.

STATEMENT OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

We consider continuation of induction authority necessary to insure that the strengths of the Active and Reserve Forces may be maintained at the levels necessary for national security. It permits us a defense posture, in an uncertain world, which assures our allies and friends that we will not desert them and serves notice to possible aggressors of our intentions to remain ready and strong.

The Nation's past experience in trying to maintain forces at levels consistent with the requirements of today or the foreseeable future is convincing evidence that the military manpower requirements could not be met without induction of registrants under the U.M.T. and S. Act and the stimulus the act has on voluntary enlistments.

We feel that aside from providing the force in being and the Reserve structure necessary for national security the act is responsible for countless peripheral contributions to individual and national well-being.

The service of our youth in the Armed Forces fosters leadership, develops character, promotes health and well-being, and creates a greater responsibility of citizenship. These attributes benefit the citizen and are vital to our national welfare. Those who do not serve in uniform and are channeled through deferment into careers of science, medicine, engineering, and teaching add to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

The Military Order of the World Wars endorses H.R. 2260 and considers it to be vital to the national security and interest. Accordingly, we respectfully urge your favorable consideration of this vital legislation by this committee.

THOMAS H. KING,
Chairman
(For the legislative committee).

ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 2, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Electronic Industries Association, the national trade association for the electronics industry, I am enclosing for your information a copy of a resolution on selective service adopted by the association's board of directors on December 4, 1958.

The resolution supports the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1948, as amended, which will expire on June 30, 1959, unless congressional action is taken. As you will note, the resolution sets forth the conclusion of the electronics industry that the Selective Service System is fair

and equitable and necessary for the proper functioning of our industrial system at the present time and in the event of a national emergency.

If appropriate, we will appreciate your inserting this letter and the supporting resolution in the record of the hearings on the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

If you have any questions concerning our position, we will be pleased to meet with you and discuss them.

Very truly yours,

JAMES D. SECREST.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 4, IN NEW YORK CITY

Whereas the Selective Service System has fulfilled the Nation's need for a fair and equitable method of recruiting members of our Armed Forces while recognizing the need for deferment of those persons whose talents could best be used in industry; and

Whereas the deferment of 1,100,000 students during the Korean war has made possible the training of 40,000 to 50,000 engineers and scientists whose services are essential to industrial support of the national defense program; and

Whereas the "critical skills" program has also aided defense industries by minimizing the time required by men of exceptional qualifications to fulfill their military obligations; and

Whereas the Selective Service System, under the able direction of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, is the only Government agency equipped by experience and trained personnel to prevent industrial collapse, in the event of a national emergency, through the orderly retention of key personnel: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Electronic Industries Association on this day Thursday, December 4, 1958, respectfully urge the President to recommend and Congress to approve continuation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1948, as amended, before its expiration on June 30, 1959.

THE UNITED CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST,
Indianapolis, Ind., February 27, 1959.

HON. RICHARD RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I appreciate very much that you have allocated time next week for citizens to present their views on the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. My schedule prevents me from appearing personally but I would like to submit a statement based on a resolution passed by the International Convention of Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ) at St. Louis, Mo., in October of 1958.

With your permission I would like to submit for the record our statement in opposition to H.R. 2260 presented before the House Armed Services Committee.

After listening to the discussion in the House I am impressed with the need for a thorough congressional study of the whole manpower problem. This certainly should be done before Congress exacts legislation extending for 4 years. I hope your committee will make an extensive study of the manpower situation. At the very least it seems that some attention should be given to the 2-year extension proposal of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO.

Cordially,

ROBERT A. FANGMEIER,
National Director, Christian Citizenship.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. FANGMEIER OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert A. Fangmeier. I am national director of Christian citizenship of the Department of Social Welfare of the United Christian Missionary Society, Indianapolis, Ind. The united society is a board of home and

oversea missions serving 8,000 Disciples of Christ Churches which have about 2 million members.

No one can speak for all Disciples of Christ. But like most national and international organizations we have a procedure through which we can make our convictions known on social issues. We do this through a program of study and action in our churches which culminates in the presentation of resolutions for the consideration of the annual assembly of the International Convention of Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ).

In October of 1958 our international convention meeting at St. Louis, Mo., urged "the discontinuance of the Universal Military Training and Service Act at its expiration date in July of 1959." I am including the text of this resolution for the record. In addition, I would like to include also for the record excerpts from previous resolutions, 1936-54, and then briefly summarize our position as it relates to the legislation you are considering.

"International Convention Meeting at St. Louis, Mo., 1958

"Whereas the Universal Military Training and Service Act will expire in July of 1959, and the Congress and American people must determine whether such a system of conscription should be continued; and

"Whereas the Disciples of Christ have stated in previous international convention resolutions that they oppose conscription as a permanent feature of American life; and

"Whereas the validity of the UMTSA concept has been thrown into doubt because in an era of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles many civilian and military authorities feel that large mass armies are useless and that only an ever-ready, technically trained, professional army meets the real needs of the nuclear age; and

"Whereas, conscription which may have outlived its usefulness even a military concept is also wrong in principle in a democratic society and should be discontinued at the earliest possible moment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the International Convention of Christian Churches assembled at St. Louis, Mo., October 17-22, 1958, urges the discontinuance of the Universal Military Training Service Act at its expiration date in July of 1959.

"International Convention Meeting at Miami, Fla., 1954

"Whereas the constant threat of war has become so much a part of our thinking in the world today that we are in danger not only of assuming that war is a necessity but also that the measures connected with waging war proposed by the governments of the nations are necessary and inevitable and in a sense therefore beyond the province of Christian ethical design, and

* * * * *

"Therefore be it

"*Resolved by this International Convention of the Disciples of Christ assembled at Miami, Fla., October 25-31, 1954:*

"1. That we call upon the churches of the brotherhood to proclaim their continued resistance to the extension of the war psychology.

"2. That we express again our opposition to universal military training in the United States in whatever form since it tends to fasten upon our people a concept of the state totally foreign to our American tradition and a spirit of futility with regard to the possibility of peace which may turn out to be one of the chief blocks to its achievement. We especially urge our people to study critically the concept of universal military service which embodies many of the worst features of universal military training as well as other objectionable ones, and which is now becoming the accepted peacetime program of training and indoctrination of our military services.

"International Convention Meeting at Chicago, Ill., 1952

* * * * *

"Whereas proponents of peacetime universal military training have declared their intention to bring this issue again to the floor of Congress despite consistent defeat over a long period of years, the most recent being the vote of the House on March 4, 1952, to recommit the bill embodying the recommendations of the National Training Commission, and

"Whereas the armed services have no difficulty in keeping their ranks filled through recruitment and through the Selective Service System, and

“Whereas some programs of peacetime universal military training that have been proposed contemplate drafting all young men before they reach maturity and have completed their education, and keeping them subject to military call over a period of years :

“Therefore be it

“Resolved:

“1. That while recognizing the need for adequate national defense, we are opposed to universal military training in principle and to the program proposed by the National Training Commission.

“2. That this resolution be transmitted to the President and to Members of the Congress.

“International Convention Meeting at San Francisco, Calif., 1948

“Whereas the Congress of the United States on June 19, 1948, enacted the Selective Service Act of 1948 requiring all male citizens between the ages of 18 and 25 to register for the military draft for conscription into the Armed Forces at the discretion of the President according to the terms of the law, and

“Whereas proponents of universal military training have expressed their intention to seek a permanent universal military training law from the 81st Congress in addition to the Selective Service Act of 1948 now in force, and

“Whereas competent leaders in the field of atomic physics, bacteriology, political and military science have warned us repeatedly that the problems now confronting the world cannot be solved by military power but only by the peaceful means of patient negotiation and international cooperation through such organizations as the United Nations.

“Whereas we recognize the importance of maintaining adequate security forces in the present world situation for the conservation of values already attained until we can effect international multilateral disarmament and enduring peace, and

“Whereas the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ has repeatedly expressed opposition to compulsory military training and service in peacetime through the conviction that such extension of authority and power of the state over the lives of its citizens is hazardous to democratic freedom and Christian morality.

“1. Therefore be it

“Resolved, That we call upon the Congress and the President of the United States to procure the necessary Armed Forces through voluntary enlistment.

“International Convention Meeting at Columbus, Ohio, 1946

* * * * *

“Whereas peacetime conscription for military training or service is a violation of the American tradition of voluntary military service and is, in our opinion, a threat to peaceful international relations, and

“Whereas the adoption of peacetime conscription for military training or service would, in our view, jeopardize our full commitment to the United Nations by setting a pattern which other nations would feel bound to follow as a matter of self-protection, and

“Whereas the future welfare of our Nation is dependent upon youth possessing spiritual foundations which are Christian and which stem largely from home, school, and church environment and for which military service has no adequate counterpart: Therefore be it

“Resolved, That this International Convention of the Disciples of Christ reaffirm our opposition to conscription for military training or service in time of peace, and that we urge our members to make known their views on this subject to the President and to Members of the Congress.

“International convention meeting at Columbus, Ohio, 1944

* * * * *

“Be it

“Resolved by the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, in session at Columbus, Ohio, October 17-22, 1944, that—

“1. We affirm our opposition to the enactment of any legislation during the present war providing for compulsory military training and service in peacetime.

“2. We call attention to the fact that there is no existing emergency which

requires such haste as marks the efforts of the advocates of the proposal, especially in view of the fact that the present Selective Service and Training Act is effective for 6 months after the end of the war.

"International convention meeting at Kansas City, Mo., 1936

* * * * *

"That we are opposed to military training in any form in American high schools, colleges, and universities. We regard the introduction of military drill into secondary schools as detrimental to sound educational procedure. We regard compulsory training in military science in colleges and universities as an unwarranted invasion of our traditional American educational liberty. We believe that military subsidies to educational institutions tend to exercise an unwholesome influence over the institutions accepting such subsidies and further tend to prevent free and open discussion matters of national policy and international relationships.

* * * * *

"We therefore urge all our churches to promote programs of education for peace and to oppose all tendencies toward militarism as subversive of American traditions and principles and of the very genius of the Briand-Kellogg Pact to which our Government is committed."

First of all, we have opposed conscription in principle as contrary to the ethical and democratic traditions of the United States. However, many of our people have accepted conscription in the past as a necessity in time of national emergency or war. But we have remained unconvinced that compulsion was necessary to obtain an adequate security force in time of peace.

In this respect we may reflect the attitude of most Americans who were willing in time of emergency to make temporary compromises with ethical and democratic principles but who are unwilling to see an essentially undemocratic pattern fastened upon our Nation as a permanent feature. It was for this reason that we said in our 1958 international convention resolution that we believed that the compulsory induction of young men into the armed services had gone on long enough. If the power to induct is extended to 1963 we will have made a tacit concession to the permanency of conscription without even adequately exploring whether voluntary methods are sufficient to obtain the required number of men in the Armed Forces.

Each extension of the power to induct, each compromise with an essentially undemocratic feature of our life, has been justified on the grounds that compulsion and only compulsion could provide the number of men required. While we cannot qualify as manpower authorities we must, when this matter of principle is involved, ask our civilian representatives in Congress to exercise their guardianship over the military by a thorough investigation of the claims that voluntary enlistments will not meet the needs of the armed services.

As Christian citizens concerned with our Nation's welfare we are compelled in these circumstances to raise questions about a policy that recognizes compulsion and only compulsion as a remedy for military manpower problems. How can we be so certain that voluntary methods will fail when no recent program making military service as attractive as civilian service has been tried? Is it not possible that some military and civilian authorities who believe in the voluntary principle are right when they say that better pay, housing, and opportunities for advancement would better serve military manpower needs?

We wonder whether the draft has not become so much of a habit that as a nation we are being asked to accept it not as a means to end but as the end itself. In other words we are raising the question of whether or not the military wants conscription as a matter of habit or principle even though it might be possible to obtain the required number of men through voluntary means. If the end the military seeks is a compulsory system rather than a voluntary one then we are led to ask whether Congress should not investigate this reluctance on their part to make the necessary reforms to secure an adequate number of volunteers. As it is, many Americans cannot escape the feeling that the principle of compulsion seems to solve many problems for the military that they would have to face if a voluntary system were tried.

There is undoubtedly one function that compulsory service serves. It indoctrinates each new generation with a military point of view and in at least some draftees suspicion and even disrespect of civilian authority and ideals. I would like to cite an example.

Recently, while chairing a panel in a church meeting on world order and peace we had as one of the participants a medical doctor who also served as the civil defense representative in that area. He told of the dangers of radioactive fallout and other hazards in the event of a nuclear war. When he had finished a young draftee in uniform stood up and asked whether all this talk about the danger of nuclear fallout was not being overemphasized by leftwing groups who wanted to endanger the security of the United States. He said this is what he had been told in indoctrination courses in the Army.

The doctor, of course, replied that everything he had said was based upon facts published by the civil defense organization, also a branch of the U.S. Government, and hardly leftwing subversives. Is this young man's experience typical of those who are indoctrinated in our armed services? If it is, we have a most unusual situation. We have one branch of the Government casting aspersions indirectly upon approved factual and presumably scientifically sound information published by another branch of the Government.

More important, however, I think the example cited may illustrate that indoctrination is one of the primary effects upon men serving their 2 years in the armed services. If indoctrination and not numbers of men is the basic reason we have conscription, then the Disciples of Christ would reaffirm their 1948 international convention resolution which declared "opposition to compulsory military training and service in peacetime through the conviction that such extension of authority and power of the state over the lives of its citizens is hazardous to democratic freedom and Christian morality."

Our opposition to H.R. 2260 is all the more firm because it seems to lead nowhere but to 4 more years of indoctrination and compulsion without any substantial effort to explore voluntarism. We would have been more impressed with a proposal that did not extend the power to induct until a full congressional investigation had been made of manpower problems in the light of recent studies and the nature of modern war. But we see no hope in this legislation. It seems to accept conscription as an end rather than a means with little promise that conscription will ever be eliminated as a feature of American life whether it serves a necessary purpose or not.

BOARD OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 27, 1959.

Mr. HARRY L. WINGATE, Jr.,
Chief Clerk, U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services,
Washington D. C.

DEAR MR. WINGATE: I deeply regret that due to a previous commitment in Alaska, it will not be possible for me to be present for the public hearing on H.R. 2260 scheduled for Tuesday, March 3.

We are enclosing our written testimony which we hope will be included in the official record of the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD EARLE,
Secretary, Department of Social Education and Action.

TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.

To the Members of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Senate:

We call your attention to the following statement relating to the proposed extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1950, prepared by the Department of Social Education and Action under authorization of the general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. We trust that this statement can be included in the official record of the hearings now being held by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has consistently opposed universal military training and peacetime conscription, such as the proposed legislation seeks to implement. This position has been upheld by the highest judicatories of both the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterian Church of North America prior to the merging of these bodies a few months ago to form the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The United Presbyterian Church has not been wanting in support the Nation in time of war—even to supporting measures of conscription in time of war. But it has stated and restated its firm opposition to universal military training as a settled policy of the Nation in time of peace. The United Presbyterian Church has stood against the threat of foreign foes. It has also seen the threat to our freedom in costly peacetime conscription and militarism.

Appended hereto are pronouncements and recommendations of several general assemblies. These we transmit to your committee as a strong testimony against proposed measures for the continuation of peacetime conscription.

U.S.A. 1947: "We reaffirm our historic position of opposition to peacetime military conscription as constituting a dangerous extension of regimentation by government, an inadequate measure of defense in an atomic age, and a violation of the spirit of our present determination to secure the multilateral reduction of arms and armies. We reaffirm our historic position in favor of voluntary enlistment to provide the military forces needed for our international commitments and national defense in an atomic age."

U.S.A. 1948: "We believe the most ominous present threat to freedom and the peace of the world lies in the militarization of the nations * * * This trend toward military domination of our society, calls for continued reliance upon a democratic voluntary system of national defense. We believe that a system of voluntary recruitment will provide adequate defense if administered by leaders who believe in it. Because of our industrial and military potentialities revealed in the last war, because of our capacity for mobilization, and because of the resources inherent in the voluntary system we go on record as opposing compulsory military training and the use of the draft in peacetime. We reaffirm the historic position of our church with respect to peacetime military conscription."

U.S.A. 1949: "We reaffirm our position to any form of universal military training or peacetime conscription. The Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has consistently supported the democratic system of voluntary recruitment. There is genuine peril that our own defense measures may precipitate the very war we fear, and that our free economy will be crushed beneath the intolerable burden of armaments."

U.S.A. 1951: "While acknowledging the necessity in this day for adequate military preparation consistent with our responsibilities under the United Nations, we would remind the church of our repeated opposition to permanent conscription, and commend a constant scrutiny of our military development program by competent civilians."

U.P. 1951: "We continue to voice our opposition to the principle of permanent peacetime conscription under any guise."

U.S.A. 1955: "While we recognize the necessity for military conscription in time of national emergency, we reaffirm the historic position of our church in opposition to peacetime conscription and universal military training. We believe that the draft should be extended only as 'the national emergency' warrants, and then for not more than 2 years at a time."

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE LEAGUE, INC.

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 3, 1959.

To the Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee:

GENTLEMEN: The National Temperance League, with 42 interchurch affiliated State temperance organizations is vitally interested in the physical and moral welfare of our boys in the armed services, particularly as related to alcoholic beverages. We are, therefore, respectfully asking you, as you consider the extension of the draft in H.R. 2260 that you reexamine the regulations and practices of the military in regard to alcoholic beverages, and the environment into which draftees may find themselves as they are drawn into military service.

At the biennial meeting of the National Temperance League held in Washington, D.C., November 26-29, 1956, the following resolution was adopted:

"Because of the concern felt by millions of Americans over the ready availability of alcoholic beverages to members of the Armed Forces, and the probability of enacting a law making U.M.T. operative to bring 17-year-old boys into the service for 6 months' training, and since under present legislation no real protection is given these boys against the 3.2 percent beer in the post exchanges,

we urge the 85th Congress, first, to investigate conditions in the military establishments resulting from the sale of 3.2 percent beer and all other alcoholic beverages to enlisted personnel and officers; furthermore, we urge the banning of the sale or serving of alcoholic beverages in all military establishments."

We are grateful that the Defense Department has adopted regulations banning 3.2 percent beer to the 6-month trainees. We believe, however, that the problems of alcohol, ranging from highway accidents and drunken brawls to alcoholism, are sufficiently serious to require some attention by your committee. The tragic deaths of six Marine recruits at Parris Island, April 8, 1956, following an episode of Vodka drinking by their drill instructor, is a case in point.

The widespread use and acceptance of alcoholic beverages by the military, with many attendant problems, is a matter of deep concern to parents and church groups. We sincerely urge you to weigh these matters most carefully as you consider the advisability or inadvisability of extending the draft.

In the matter of the extension of the draft as proposed in H.R. 2260, the National Temperance League has taken no official position for or against.

Yours sincerely,

CLAYTON M. WALLACE,
Executive Director, National Temperance League.

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
New Haven, Conn., February 10, 1959.

HON. RICHARD RUSSELL,
*Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: We are enclosing a copy of the resolution upon which we voted at our last meeting.

It is our earnest hope that you will present it to the Armed Services Committee at its hearings on this measure so that they may have an expression of our opinion.

We shall be interested to learn the action of this committee.

Sincerely yours,

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH.
THE PEACE COMMITTEE,
ORPAH S. BLAZIER, *Secretary.*

STATEMENT OF PEACE COMMITTEE OF FIRST METHODIST CHURCH, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Be it Resolved, That the peace committee of the First Methodist Church of New Haven, Conn., voted at its meeting on February 8, 1959, to oppose the extension of the Selective Service Act which expires in June 1959, for the following reasons:

1. It conflicts with American peacetime traditions.
2. It interferes with education at a crucial point by robbing America of vitally needed leadership.
3. It is discriminatory and economically wasteful.
4. It encourages the acceptance of militarization of youth at an impressionable age.
5. It relieves the draftee of moral responsibility to God for his actions against his fellow man.

STATEMENT OF POST WAR WORLD COUNCIL

NEW YORK, March 2, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: We shall greatly appreciate your placing the following letter into the record of the hearings your committee is holding on the extension of the Selective Service Act.

The costs of conscription extend into many areas of American life. There can probably be no exact count of the dollars and cents cost. To begin with,

the Selective Service System itself, whether or not it actually drafts anyone, cost \$26,643,418 in the fiscal year 1958. This process of registering and classifying will continue in any event.

There is also a growing dissatisfaction with conscription as an effective instrument of modern military action on the part of many influential Americans, including an occasional official. Maj. Thomas J. McDonald, writing in "Army," said: "But such a force [one with complex technical skills] cannot be built around UMT. We will need long-term regulars receiving adequate inducements to offset a rigorous training program."

Our Government is conducting a running debate on shifting its major military buildup to missiles and nuclear weapons. Even in its present establishment, with some atomic weapons considered standard equipment, soldiers cannot be adequately trained to handle complex weapons in the 2-year draft period. Few draftees, only 3 out of every 100, stay beyond their 2-year period. This inadequate training results in an estimated waste of \$5 billion worth of equipment by the handling of inexperienced men.

In Great Britain, a Conservative government, engaged in remodeling its long-range military plans, is considering dropping its conscription. It has already decided not to use its present law after 1960. It expires in 1962. Other countries, offered generous amounts of military aid by the United States, have asked instead for economic aid.

This touches another dilemma in our Government's policy; whether to build our foreign policy around economic development, both at home and abroad, or around a policy of military containment. With more and more individuals, official and unofficial, admitting the impossibility of all-out war and another group's trying to imagine the likelihood of limited war, the possibilities of a shift to economic aid improve. Even so high an official as Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, has said that he has "every evidence" that the Soviet Union would seek world domination "short of war." The increased economic aid by the U.S.S.R. to Asian countries bears this out. Needless to say, in an economic program, conscription would play little or no part. It merely takes 2 years out of the lives of our best young men, those with the highest IQ's and best physiques, leaving our less fit youth to further economic progress.

The costs of conscription can only partially be measured in dollars. There are the costs to the young men themselves in delays in starting a family or a career; the molding of personalities to fit an automatic military obedience, often the direct opposite of what is needed for a democratic civilian life.

What with the delays of a bureaucracy in drafting an individual and then a period of readjustment after the 2 years of service, there may be as many as 4 or 5 years before a young man is able to begin whatever plans he may have. He may well find the long years of scientific or medical training burdensome or even impossible by that time.

The causes of juvenile and adult delinquency are debated on all sides but can the neglect of civilian morals by a military discipline be unrelated? The Secretary of the Navy has said: "The AWOL rate [in the Navy] rose 30 percent in 1957 over 1956 and courts-martial continue at the rate of 1,000 a week. The human and financial losses * * * cannot be afforded."

So far the Pentagon has decided its question of military policy by asking for more men (and, of course, more money) and Congress, with little debate except criticism of the President for lack of expansiveness, has given it to them. Even in the face of the repeated questions: "Why is Russia producing more engineers? Why is Russia several years ahead of us in rockets and missiles?" the Pentagon has asked for, and the House of Representatives has agreed to give them, a 4-year extension of the power to draft men.

We hope that your committee will give weighty attention to alternatives to an extension of the power to draft men who are temporarily and often inefficiently used.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN SITEMAN, *Executive Secretary*,

STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1959.

SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRs: Enclosed is the five-page statement of our new national chairman, Frederick Freilicher of Harvard University, concerning the merits of extension or revision of the current laws on selective service which is now before your committee.

I received oral reassurances on the phone today from members of your staff that such a statement, if received by March 6, can be included in your record.

On behalf of Students for Democratic Action, I thank you for this courtesy.

I am,

Respectfully yours,

GORDON GRAHAM,
Executive Secretary.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK FREILICHER, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

You have probably heard of the silent generation. Today's youth are described by leading magazines as cautious, calculating, and unwilling to commit themselves. Perhaps their apathy is a reflection of the apathy of their Government—a Government which will not even take the trouble to consider changes in the one law which affects young people more than any other, a law which few people defend in its present form, the Selective Service Act.

Have you ever thought that another reason for their apathy might be that the college class of 1959 cannot plan its future more than a year in advance? They do not know if and when they are going to be called by the draft.

Worse, today's youth cannot see how present draft policies agree with the limited war strategic doctrine now favored by the Army. Many of them justifiably feel that they can serve their country better with their brains or with their special skills than by carrying a rifle.

Today's college students are as patriotic as those of any other generation. It is the present inequitable draft system which puts a premium on procrastination and avoidance of patriotic duty.

It is no secret that reexamining the draft means raising embarrassing political questions. The easiest thing to do is to sweep the whole problem under the rug by extending the present law for 4 years. Before you take the easy way out, we hope that the Senate will remember that in so doing they are throwing a needless monkey wrench into millions of lives.

You may have read an article written by Dean John C. Esty of Amherst (*The Nation*, Jan. 10, 1959). In this article Dean Esty cited promising classics majors who switched to the physical sciences because they heard that physicists are more likely to be deferred. He found seniors rushing prematurely into marriage or into graduate school in order to escape the draft. Promising scientists are forced to plan their training with one eye on a draft law which may make them into rifle-toting Ph. D.'s.

The "silent generation" is not an unpartiotic one; today's students are ready and willing to serve their country. It is the responsibility of the U.S. Congress to see that their service is not wasted.

We in the Students for Democratic Action do not claim to be experts on military policy. It is clear, however, that there is considerable question as to how many ground troops will be needed in a future war. We are told by military experts that future conflicts are most likely to be brush-fire wars to be fought by highly mobile, specially trained units. We are further told by Generals Gavin and Ridgway that given present transportation capability it will take the Army a month to transport even one division to any future hot spot. It was all we could do to transport a couple of Marine battalions to Lebanon last summer. In other words, we do not have enough planes to transport the men we have now. Furthermore, there is a serious question as to whether a draftee can absorb enough training to make him a good fighter in a limited nuclear war. Perhaps then, the Army's first need is for more air transport and more training for Regular Army units now in being than for more draftees.

What contributes most to the student's feeling of futility is the absurdity of the present Reserve structure. In the words of Prof. Barton Leach of the Harvard Law School (also adviser to the Secretary of the Air Force), "our pres-

ent Reserve system is best suited for the Indian wars." The Army, feeling that 6 months is not enough time to train a soldier, rushes its 6-month recruits through an inadequate training program. These recruits then return to home units to attend Ready Reserve meetings which are notorious farces. Small wonder that the Army has put less than a million men on drill pay status instead of the 2.9 million that Congress has authorized. Unless the 6 months are devoted to whole-hearted intensive training the products of the present 6-month program are not likely to be useful in any future war. The college student senses this and feels that his whole military obligation is a waste of time.

It is therefore important not that one or two gimmicks be adopted, but that our whole policy of recruitment be reexamined and put on a more rational basis. There have been many suggestions for revisions in the draft law which would break up fewer lives and careers than at present. Plans have been advanced which would make the draft system more consistent with actual manpower needs and strategic doctrine of the Armed Forces, and which would make better use of the talents of the college-educated draftees. We cite some of these as examples of programs that should be studied in an effort to develop a coherent manpower policy.

The first general approach is that of the Cordiner report, which hopes to lessen our dependence on the draft by creating a skilled professional army. As you know, the plan calls for incentive pay for technical specialists and higher pay and better living conditions for all military personnel, especially for those with several years of training. In the words of the report :

"The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities."

Such a program might enable us to lessen our dependents on the draft or perhaps eliminate it entirely. To this program might be added an increase in the pay of the recruit and a speeding of the promotion of noncommissioned officers. Manpower requirements might also be lessened in certain cases by increased reliance on civilian personnel and facilities for administrative and maintenance work.

A second general approach attempts to eliminate some of the uncertainties resulting from present draft policy. These programs would make clear cut and predictable policies, which up to now, have been subject to bureaucratic caprice. An example of such a policy might be the explicit recognition that certain occupations, say for example scientists and high school and college teachers, serve the Nation better in their present civilian roles, than they would in uniform. These people would then be permitted to fulfill their military obligation in a civilian capacity. Similarly, other specially trained men might serve out their military obligation by teaching or giving technical assistance in underdeveloped countries, or serving in other hard-to-fill Government posts. Consideration should also be given to plans which would limit the draft to those men between the ages of 18 and 20 years, which the Army feels are the best ages for military training.

We must take this opportunity to redefine the draft law so as to make every man's military obligation reasonably equitable and explicit. We therefore urge the Senate not to extend the draft law in its present form, but to take this opportunity to revamp our manpower policy, in order to bring it into line with strategic doctrine and the needs of American youth. Only then can our first taste of citizenship be not draft dodging but willing service.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GLADYCE G. MUSE

RICHMOND, VA., March 3, 1959.

The CHAIRMAN,
Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

How much longer must our young men submit to slavery via the draft law? Since American soldiers are not afforded protection why not end the draft? How about the 951 American soldiers listed as prisoners of war at time of Korean armistice whom the Pentagon brass killed off in their files? How about the status of forces treaty allowing our soldiers to be tried in foreign courts? How about 9 of 17 American servicemen in unarmed American military plane shot down recently in Soviet Armenia?

The President of the United States does not care about American soldiers. I plead for my two sons of draft age. Let law expire this year. Please insert my message in hearings.

Mrs. GLADYCE G. MUSE.

STATEMENT OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Merle E. Hopper, national legislative director, representing the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. Our organization seriously considered the matter of extension of the draft at the Springfield, Ill., convention in September 1958, and as a result of that study and consideration the delegates adopted a resolution declaring that such extension is necessary in any realistic view of our Nation's defense requirements. A copy of the resolution is attached.

We welcome the opportunity to present to this committee the position of the Veterans of World War I on this legislation.

Our organization is made up of men who served in the first conflict in which the Nation relied on a draft system in its modern form. Our Selective Service system has served the Nation well in World War I, in World War II, and in the years of tension since it was reenacted in 1948. Its existence was a key factor in this country's ability to respond and to meet the world crisis posed by the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. We believe that the principles of selective service are more needed than ever when, as in this age, warfare threatens to involve whole populations and to require every ounce of a nation's strength.

Compulsory military service has enabled this Nation to accept its role as a leader in the free world's struggle against Communist efforts to dominate mankind. Commitments have been made by us to lead the free world in this struggle, and up to now we have been able to maintain the military forces necessary to give these commitments meaning due to the selective service system. We can continue to maintain that military strength only by insuring that the Armed Forces are kept at the required strength. In our judgment, the only way to insure that strength is to extend the authority to induct men under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Furthermore, we must be able to expand our military power without delay to meet eventualities which may arise at any time under today's world conditions. We must show no signs of wavering in our determination to defend the way of life which is our heritage.

It is our considered judgment that only by extending the induction authority until July 1, 1963, can we make apparent this country's will to remain strong. And, just as important, it is the only way we can actually maintain that strength which is indispensable to attainment of our goal of a lasting peace.

We have full confidence that your clear sense of calm justice will guide your deliberations in this matter, bearing in mind that in the past selective service has proven itself and will continue to do so in the future.

We, the representatives of 2,800,000 living veterans of World War I respectfully urge that this committee approve this legislation to continue the authority to induct men under the Universal Military Training and Service Act until July 1, 1963.

RESOLUTION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I NATIONAL CONVENTION SPRINGFIELD, ILL., SEPTEMBER 16-22, 1958

Subject: Extension of induction authority under Universal Military Training and Service Act to July 1, 1963.

Whereas section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, provides that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces under that act after July 1, 1959, with the exception of persons whose deferments under section 6 of such act have ceased to exist; and

Whereas selective service is based on the accepted principle of the universal obligation and privilege of all citizens to defend this Nation; and

Whereas the impending termination of induction authority under the aforesaid act will leave our Nation without an effective obligation for every young man to serve his country in a military capacity; and

Whereas the continuance of authority to induct all persons liable therefor under the aforesaid act is essential to insure the maintenance of the required strength of the Armed Forces since voluntary enlistments in such forces and

their reserve components are greatly stimulated and influenced by the mere existence of that induction authority; and

Whereas the existence of full induction authority enables the Selective Service System (1) to insure that the required strength of the active Armed Forces be maintained both directly by inductions and indirectly by stimulating enlistments, (2) to assist in maintaining the required strength of the Reserve Forces by deferring inductions of members who serve satisfactorily, and (3) by classifications deferring induction, to channel men possessing critical skills or the requisite ability to acquire them into essential activities and occupations including engineering, scientific and technical pursuits and teaching, and the study and preparation for such fields; and

Whereas the Selective Service System maintains through registration an inventory of all men of military age including the only inventory of veterans no longer in the Armed Forces who in an emergency might be needed quickly for augmentation of those forces, and keeps current the availability for order to active duty in time of emergency of over a million members of the Standby Reserve; and

Whereas selective service has become an integral part of the Nation's defense and the Selective Service System, by its decentralized system of operation through over 4,000 local and appeal boards in every community made up of local citizens, has earned and enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the American people; and

Whereas the local boards of the Selective Service System in every community of this Nation would render invaluable service in the event of an all-out emergency because of their ability to furnish manpower at local levels to any agency authorized to requisition men for specific duties, and

Whereas some 40,000 of the 46,000 full- and part-time officers and employees of the Selective Service System have volunteered their services to the Government and received no compensation; and

Whereas the annual cost of operating the Selective Service System is only about 16 cents for every man, woman, and child in this Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., national convention assembled in Springfield, Ill., September 16 through September 22, 1958, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 625), as amended, be further amended so that all the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces now provided by that act will be extended until July 1, 1963, and that Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. use all of its efforts and influence to this end.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N.Y., March 5, 1959.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The National Association of Manufacturers wishes to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate Armed Services Committee its views and recommendations relative to legislation (H.R. 2260) dealing with the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act.

The association represents some 20,000 manufacturers throughout the country which produce over three-quarters of our Nation's goods. The association's research committee, of approximately 200 members, represents a large and important segment of employers of highly trained scientists and engineers. Thus the NAM is vitally concerned with the most efficient utilization of our technological manpower.

We recognize that in these uncertain times our national security requires adequately staffed military forces. We further recognize that a planned, orderly process for obtaining manpower for the military forces is necessary, hence we do not question the need for extension of the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act.

Nevertheless, we believe you will agree that effective mobilization of manpower is a selective process; everyone must serve the Nation where most needed, but not necessarily in the same capacity. In view of the technological age in which we live, scientists and engineers are of utmost importance to the defense of our Nation. It is essential that such trained manpower be utilized at the peak of their capacity and training, both in military and civilian occupations.

We are most anxious that effective machinery be established so that, in the event of a war or national emergency, industry essential to defense will be able to perform its necessary role. It is obvious that we are already in a period of national technological emergency in our scientific and economic struggle with the Soviet Union. The Russians have recognized the importance of supporting and encouraging scientists and engineers as evidenced, for example, by their great strides in the missile and nuclear weapon development. We cannot afford to do less.

The NAM has been seriously concerned with more efficient utilization of our highly trained people ever since 1950. Last year, the association, through its research committee, in its continuing study of this matter, reviewed and revised its policy position in this area; I am taking the liberty of reproducing it herewith:

"SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING MANPOWER PROBLEM"

"Industry believes that technological progress has become so vital to the defense of our country and to its economic health that steps should be taken promptly to insure that the supply of technological manpower is adequate in quality and numbers, and that scientists and engineers serve their country in their highest individual capability.

"Specifically, in order to achieve these objectives, industry recommends that the President appoint:

"1. A commission composed of experienced, specifically qualified men in manpower problems of established eminence and integrity, familiar with the role and importance of technology in national affairs, both industrial and military, to review governmental policies on technological manpower and to advise him on training and efficient utilization of such manpower; and

"2. An essentially civilian national appeal board to act upon appeals of individual scientists, engineers, and other critical manpower subject to the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 where final decisions must be reached as to whether these individuals are more essential in military or civilian activity.

"Industry believes that these measures are of paramount importance and should be acted upon without delay."

We respectfully request that, prior to reporting of the legislation out of your committee, you give serious and sympathetic consideration to a recommendation for the establishment of a commission to advise the President on the most efficient utilization of highly trained personnel to guarantee that they will serve our country to their best capability.

Sincerely yours,

GUY S. PEPPIATT,
Chairman, Committee on Research.

THE FIVE YEARS MEETING OF FRIENDS,
BOARD ON PEACE AND SOCIAL CONCERNS,
Richmond, Ind., March 4, 1959.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The board on peace and social concerns of the Five Years Meeting of Friends requests that the attached statement by Byron Haworth, on behalf of the board, be incorporated in the printed hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the question of extension of the military draft.

We did not learn of the hearing schedule in time to request a personal appearance, and would appreciate opportunity to have this statement made a part of the printed record.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON H. HADLEY,
Executive Secretary.

TESTIMONY OF BYRON HAWORTH, JUDGE, HIGH POINT MUNICIPAL COURT, HIGH POINT, N.C., FOR THE BOARD ON PEACE AND SOCIAL CONCERNS OF THE FIVE YEARS MEETING OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

My name is Byron Haworth. I live in High Point, N.C., where I serve as judge of the High Point municipal court.

I am presenting testimony to this committee in behalf of the board on peace and social concerns of The Five Years Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), with headquarters and principal offices in Richmond, Ind. It would be to the best interest of the United States to let the forced induction processes of the selective-service law expire June 30, 1959.

The fundamental ground of our opposition to conscription is religious and ethical. The first military conscription law in the modern sense was passed in France in 1798. This law and all other draft acts have consistently been used as a tool for carrying on modern warfare. Conscription of manpower has no purpose apart from war preparation or actual war. Friends have consistently insisted that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain precepts of our Divine Lord and lawgiver and the whole spirit and tenor of His gospel; and that no plea of necessity or policy, however urgent or peculiar can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe unto Him who has said, "Love your enemies." Under our interpretation of Christian gospel, we cannot recognize two doctrines, one for individuals as between themselves and another for nations.

Try as hard as we may when confronted with emergencies, either imagined or real, we cannot picture our Lord triggering a gun to hurl death and destruction upon a fellow human being whose only offense was that he chanced to be born under another flag.

If this is the true position and attitude of our Master and Lord, how can a great Christian nation such as ours consistently impose permanent conscription on our young, immature boys, whether or not our country is faced with an emergency?

According to the Christian faith and democratic philosophy ultimate values are incarnated in the individual human being, not in any institution or system. Conscription is a basic evil because it robs our drafted boys of their freedom to decide whether they shall kill or be killed, or be trained or not trained for organized killing. These decisions, obviously involving the greatest moral issues and the individual draftee's own survival as a responsible moral being, are made for him by others, by the impersonal mechanism which has swallowed him up.

Conscription of youth at an early age is especially reprehensible because it forces upon them decisions which they are not mature enough to face. In many cases their whole future life attitude may be determined by the course which the State forces upon them. At a critical period in their adolescence, at a most impressionable age, they are subjected to training based on an acceptance of militarism and on a philosophy of mechanical, unquestioning obedience which is bound to unfit them for responsible citizenship in a democracy.

August B. Hollingshead in a study entitled "Adjustment to Military Life" in the American Journal of Sociology, March 6, 1946, said:

"The perfectly trained soldier is one who has had his civilian initiative reduced to zero. In the process the self becomes identified with the institution and dependent upon it for direction and stimulation. The ideally adjusted soldier would be a military dependent who looks to the institution for all his personal, social and emotional satisfaction * * * for these reasons the recruit must be remade; as any old sergeant knows, 'A recruit is not worth a damn until he has been broken.'"

One of our most generally accepted criticisms of the various totalitarian regimes has been precisely that they took children at an early age and indoctrinated them with ideas of war and the glories of the regimented life in which the individual does not count and the power of ethical decision is taken from him.

Military conscription is a direct infringement of several individual liberties specifically protected by the Constitution and is repugnant to American traditions. It has been tolerated by public opinion until the present only because the people have been convinced that emergency situations have rendered it necessary.

The people in my part of the country, with whom I have talked, believe it is now time for Congress to do a comprehensive job of rewriting the Selective Service Act. We hope you won't take the easy way out by pushing through a simple extension of the present laws.

In my own community I know of dissatisfaction with this law because it operates inequitably and unfairly. The flaw in this universal service plan seems to be that it cannot be applied fairly without yielding far more manpower than the armed services need or want.

The Defense Department's Study Committee headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the General Electric Co., says the real personnel problem in the Armed Forces today is quality rather than quantity.

"Strategy and tactics are undergoing radical change," the report said, "Yet strangely enough, the principles and practices which guide the recruitment, motivation, compensation and development of men have not changed substantially in the history of our country.

"The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities."

Thousands of people emigrated from Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Poland, and other conscription countries to the United States to be free from this type of military conscription and to breathe the free air of America.

Rather than continuing the system of military conscription, let us as a country put our efforts on the search for universal disarmament, on strengthening the peacemaking activities of the United Nations, on sharing our resources with the peoples of developing nations who are eager for their lives and their standards of living to be improved. Let our competition with the Soviet Union be in extending the ideals of freedom, and of helping people help themselves toward a better life, instead of a mounting arms race that points toward annihilation or bankruptcy.

HEADQUARTERS, FIGHTING HOMEFOLKS OF FIGHTING MEN, GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO.

MARCH 3, 1959.

CHAIRMAN, ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I request that the following testimony be read to your committee and published in the collected testimony of the hearings on the draft extension act.

TESTIMONY

My name is Capt. Eugene R. Guild, U.S. Army, retired, of Glenwood Springs, Colo., national director of and testifying on behalf of Fighting Homefolks of Fighting Men, a national organization of approximately 1,000 kith and kin of American fighting men captured by, shot down by, or last seen alive in the hands of the Communists.

If the soldier is important to our national security, the security of the soldier is equally important to the United States. There is, in the words of a famous statesman, "An essential mutuality about the respective obligations of the soldier to his country and of the country to its soldier."

The soldier who fails in his obligation can be court-martialed and shot. But the high, policymaking official who fails in his obligation to the soldier invites no penalty upon himself, even when his failure as it does today, damages the morale of all our soldiers, damaging in turn the national defense.

How have high officials failed in their obligation to the soldier?

1. General MacArthur testified that he was not allowed by higher authority to give his soldiers the traditional routine protection to which they were entitled.

2. When Gen. Mark Clark protested against signing the Korean war armistice because the Communists were failing to comply with its terms by releasing all of our captured soldiers, he was ordered by higher authority to "sign it anyway."

3. Thus 450 of our soldiers last seen alive in Communists hands and 2,691 others without capture eyewitnesses were abandoned to the enemy.

4. When the Soviets shot down some 50 of our men over neutral areas, and 22 of them were later seen alive in captivity, the Government merely made token protests which were never backed up.

5. When 83 weary, grief-stricken mothers of the missing waited for him on the White House sidewalk for 2 days in April 1954, the Commander in Chief refused to see them or speak to them.

6. When these same mothers asked the courts of justice to enforce equal loyalty between the Government and the soldier, they were told in effect, "the Commander in Chief is above the law."

7. When, just yesterday, Louisiana, Indiana, and Pennsylvania mothers of airmen recently shot down by the Soviets asked the Commander in Chief whether, in the American tradition, he was willing to risk his own safety for his men, they were met with the cynical White House reply, "no comment."

Therefore, in justice to the soldier, to prevent damage to the national defense by loss of soldier morale, and to remove the threat to peace involved in the Government's willingness to surrender its soldiers' freedoms and by implication our other freedoms, the draft extension law must be amended to penalize the high officials not living up to the same oath demanded of the American soldier.

EUGENE R. GUILD,
Captain, U.S. Army, Retired, Director.

STATEMENT OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The Catholic War Veterans of the United States wish to make known to the Senate Armed Services Committee their support to extend the Universal Military Training Act until July 31, 1963. This action is now being considered by the committee in the form of H.R. 2260.

We trust you and the committee members will take favorable action on this legislation.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM J. GILL, *Executive Director.*

Senator STENNIS. Without objection, the committee will recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m. the hearing was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

APPENDIX

(The material printed in the appendix was received too late for inclusion in the body of the hearings.)

APPENDIX I

The following statement requested by Senator Case, giving the cost of 3-year enlistees as compared to 2-year inductees, is referred to on page 180:

On the basis of cost data supplied by the Army a 3-year enlistee costs a total of \$17,474. Allowing for initial training, processing, travel and leave, he provides approximately 29 months of effective service. His average cost per effective month of service is about \$603.

A 2-year inductee costs a total of \$11,997, and provides 17 months of effective service. His average cost per effective month of service is about \$706.

It would therefore cost approximately \$3,000 more to obtain the same 29 months of total effective service from inductees as can be obtained from one enlistee.

The following article is referred to by Mr. David Whatley on page 145:

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION.*

By HARROP A. FREEMAN, *Virginia Law Review*
Vol. XXXI, No. 1, December 1944

THERE has been much written, pro and con, concerning the federal government's constitutional power to conscript men or women for training and service in the armed forces. Both sides have been guilty of quoting judicial statements completely out of their context and citing cases for propositions not in fact decided. Extreme advocates of military power have gone so far as to claim that the Constitution is inoperative in war time and that the government may do anything necessary to "wage war successfully."¹ On the other hand, such a constitutional authority as Daniel Webster employed language in opposition to

*A professor of law at the College attended by Jefferson, who publishes his article at the School founded by that great proponent of people's rights against government, need not apologize for giving attention to the single greatest challenge to those rights to-day. A great deal more research is needed in this field which remains to be pioneered. The pertinency of the question is further attested by the pending May Bill, H. R. 3947 and Guernsey-Wadsworth Bill, S. 701, H. R. 1806 for which the President is urging passage in January, 1945. I shall not discuss the constitutionality of President Roosevelt's suggestion of one year of non-military service (like the C. C. C.). There is even less justification in the Constitution for such an act.

1. RANDALL, *CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS UNDER LINCOLN* (1926) 30; H. R. REP. No. 2124, 77th Cong. 2nd Sess. (1942) 147; HUGHES, *WAR POWERS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION* (1936) 42 A. B. A. Rep. 232, 238; HATCHER, *MARTIAL LAW AND HABEAS CORPUS* (1940) 46 W. VA. L. Q. 187; CORWIN, *AMERICAN GOVERNMENT IN WARTIME* (1943) 37 AM. POL. SCI. REV. 18 ff.

That all these assertions go too far can be seen from George Washington's letter transmitting the Constitution to Congress:

"The friends of our country have long seen and desired that the power of making war, peace, and treaties; that of levying money and regulating commerce; and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities, shall be fully and effectually vested in the general government of the Union. But the impropriety of delegating such extensive trust to one body of men is evident. Thence results the necessity of a different organization."

1 ELLIOT'S *DEBATES* 305 (References herein are to the 1876 edition—a more convenient form is the 1941 edition, the first three volumes being included in new volume I and 4 and 5 in II).

In short the Convention is saying: Many people may have desired unlimited federal power in a given area—this Constitution is a compromise (and wisely so) based on limited power.

military conscription which would have rendered impossible any compulsory service, including jury or road maintenance duty.²

We must eschew this kind of analysis. It is clear that there *are* limits on the war power as there are on every federal power. We must try, as the Court did in the *Second Flag Salute* case,³ to find sound constitutional rules to "translate the majestic generalities of the Bill of Rights, conceived as part of the pattern of liberal government in the eighteenth century, into concrete restraints on officials dealing with the problems of the twentieth century." Since this article is of interest to laymen as well as to lawyers, I shall seek to avoid being narrowly legalistic. I shall not, however, attempt to advance our discussion by those "oversimplifications, handy in political debate", but lacking "the precision necessary to * * * judicial reasoning" as the government did in the flag case in urging broad governmental powers on the basis of Lincoln's dilemma: "Must a government of necessity be too *strong* for the liberties of its people, or too *weak* to maintain its own existence?"—the use of which called forth the Supreme Court censure.^{3a}

I shall state several broad avenues of judicial approach down which we must go in facing the issue of conscription, with which approaches most constitutional lawyers would readily agree. I shall then attempt to work out a sound delimitation of federal power, from the Constitution and cases. These approaches and the conclusions reached are first stated in outline form and are then more fully developed and annotated in separate paragraphs.

Outline.

A. General Approach.

1. *Dicta*, i. e., incidental remarks not necessary to a decision are no authority in later cases.

2. 14 WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF DANIEL WEBSTER (1903 ed.) 55-69. Yet such services have been enforced: *Butler v. Perry*, 240 U. S. 328, 36 Sup. Ct. 258 (1916); *Crews v. Lundquist*, 361 Ill. 193, 197 N. E. 768 (1935).

3. *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 636, 639, 63 Sup. Ct. 1178, 1184, 1186 (1943).

3a. Fairman, *The Law of Martial Rule and the National Emergency* (1942) 55 HARV. L. REV. 1253, 1278, makes use of another of Lincoln's expressions to advance the military argument: "by general law, life and limb must be protected, yet often a limb must be amputated to save a life; but life is never given to save a limb."

2. Even past decisions of the Supreme Court must be re-examined as to their constitutional soundness. Previous decisions have been reversed by the court.
3. There is a strong and growing recognition by the Court that the civil rights of individuals must be carefully protected against government encroachment—even though the government is thereby incommoded.
4. In our plan of government the civil must always be supreme over the military.
5. No emergency, not even war, suspends the Constitution.
6. The federal government has only those powers granted it by the Constitution; it has no “inherent” power and must keep within the powers given.
7. A variety of rules of construction must be harmonized so as to discover the true spirit of the Constitution, leaving every part fully operative within its own proper sphere.

B. *Constitutional Provisions and Court Decisions.*

1. The only powers conferred on the federal government, important to this discussion, are in these words:

Art. 1, Sec. 8. “The Congress shall have power. * * *
 “To declare War. * * *”

“To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

“To provide and maintain a Navy;

“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

“To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

“To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of Training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; * * *

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers. * * *

Art. II, Sec. 2. “The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; * * *”

Amendment II.

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

2. There is no court decision wherein it was necessary to uphold peacetime conscription; no court decision authorizing conscription into military service of women or those religiously opposed to war; there are two decisions fully reasoning the constitutional validity of wartime conscription. All decisions or dicta concerning conscription may have to be re-evaluated in the light of the tendencies discussed in the General Approach, above, and in view of the conditions of modern war.

C. *A Constitutionally Sound Military System.*1. *In Peacetime.*

- (a) The federal government cannot conscript for training the general manpower of the country. The adult manpower constitutes the *militia*, which is a State organization existing without conscription. These men can only be trained by the states as a militia, i. e., at home, "civilians primarily (shopkeepers, doctors, lawyers); soldiers on occasion."
- (b) Women are not part of the militia and cannot be conscripted and trained for military service by either the State or Federal government.
- (c) Those conscientiously opposed to bearing arms cannot be conscripted or trained in the militia for military service.
- (d) It was intended that the federal government should have a small standing army of volunteers. The States were to maintain no troops.

2. *In Wartime.*

- (a) War is a factual condition and may exist without formal declaration, thus bringing into play the war powers.
- (b) There is no limit on the size of the federal volunteer army or upon its use.
- (c) When attacked the federal government may call, by draft or other fair method, any or all of the state militia (the general manpower) into the national service until the attack has been repulsed.

The federal government may use these men abroad, for "repel" includes to "drive back". The attack may occur at any one of our possessions, or perhaps even to one of our ships or nationals.

- (d) Under modern war conditions it may be that direct conscription of general manpower into a federal "wartime army" is proper.
- (e) The protection of religious freedom and similar exists in wartime as in peacetime, and persons conscientiously opposed to war cannot be conscripted for military service or compelled to fight.

Dicta Is No Authority.

It would normally not be necessary to cite this rule to lawyers. Yet the frequency with which exponents of peacetime conscription have relied solely on dicta compels the reference. Typical of the military's attempt to sustain compulsory conscription is the article of Major Claude B. Mickelwait of the Judge Advocate General's Office.^{3b} He quotes from *Tarbles* case,⁴ *Jacobsen v. Massachusetts*,⁵ *In re Grimley*⁶ and *U. S. v. Williams*⁷ as his sole authorities for upholding peacetime conscription. Not only do these cases not involve peacetime conscription; they do not involve conscription—peacetime or wartime. *Tarble* was a minor who volunteered without his parents' consent; *U. S. v. Williams* upheld the enlistment of a minor though his parents attempted to attach conditions to their consent. *Grimley* was another enlistee who sought discharge from the army on the ground that he was over age when he volunteered. The *Jacobsen* case involved compulsory vaccination of civilians. Major Mickelwait could cite no authorities since there were none—there had not been a federal peacetime conscription law prior to 1940. As discussed elsewhere in this article, no cases subsequent to 1940 and prior to Pearl Harbor squarely ruled on the constitutionality of peacetime conscription.

3b. (1940) 26 A. B. A. Jour. 701.

4. 13 Wall. 397, 408 (U. S. 1871).

5. 197 U. S. 11, 29, 25 Sup. Ct. 358, 374 (1904).

6. 137 U. S. 147, 153, 11 Sup. Ct. 54, 59 (1890).

7. 302 U. S. 46, 48, 58 Sup. Ct. 81, 83 (1937).

Tendency of the Supreme Court to Reverse Previous Extremely Nationalistic Decisions.

A list of cases in which the Supreme Court has reversed itself when mature judgment proved that its prior position was wrong, are found in *Helvering v. Griffiths*.⁸ Nearly everyone knows that the "white primary" case, *Grovey v. Townsend*,⁹ which had held that negroes could be barred from party primaries without violation of the federal constitution, was reversed in April 1944, the Court saying: "when convinced of former error, this Court has never felt constrained to follow precedent."¹⁰

But it is to reversals or reversals in effect, which are more specifically related to conscription that we must turn. *Gilbert v. Minnesota*¹¹ had held, during the last war, that a man could be found guilty of the crime of causing disaffection in the armed services under a state anti-espionage statute, for saying:

"Have you had anything to say as to whether we would go into this war? You know you have not. If this is such a great democracy, for Heaven's sake why should we not vote on conscription of men. We were stampeded into this war by newspaper rot to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire for her. I tell you if they conscripted wealth like they have conscripted men, this war would not last over forty-eight hours."

Under a somewhat similar Mississippi statute the Court recently held¹² that a person could not constitutionally be found guilty of a crime for stating:

"that it was wrong for our President to send our boys across in uniform to fight our enemies; that it was wrong to fight our enemies; that these boys were being shot down for no purpose at all; * * * that the quicker people here quit bowing down and worshipping and saluting our flag and Government the sooner we would have peace."

or for passing out literature, which read in part:

8. 318 U. S. 371, 401, 63 Sup. Ct. 636, 652 (1943). See also the list in 88 L. Ed. (adv.) 701, 709 (1944).

9. 295 U. S. 45, 55 Sup. Ct. 622 (1934).

10. *Allwright v. Smith*, 88 L. Ed. (adv.) 701, 709 (1944). See Cushman, *The Texas "White Primary" Case—Smith v. Allwright* (1944) 30 CORN. L. Q. 66.

11. 254 U. S. 325, 41 Sup. Ct. 125 (1919).

12. *Taylor v. Mississippi*, 319 U. S. 583, 63 Sup. Ct. 1200 (1943).

“Almighty God commands that they (true Christians) must remain entirely neutral in the controversy. * * * the so-called democracies hold out no hope of peace, security, life or happiness * * * if there is a conflict between state law and what Jehovah’s witnesses conceive to be Jehovah’s law, the state law should not be obeyed * * *”

At a later point in this article the extent to which the Schneiderman communist case has overruled the two conscientious objector cases of Macintosh and Schwimmer is discussed.

In the *Gobitis case*¹³ in 1941 the Court had held that a child of the Jehovah’s Witness faith could be compelled to salute the American flag as a necessary part of achieving the patriotic solidarity which it was believed could alone carry forward the war. In June of 1943, in *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*,¹⁴ the Court reversed its position on the ground that religious and similar liberties “are susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the state may lawfully protect * * *” Justice Jackson went on to say:

“The freedom asserted by these appellees does not bring them into collision with rights asserted by any other individual * * * The sole conflict is between authority and rights of the individual. * * *

“Government of limited power need not be anemic government. Assurance that rights are secure tends to diminish fear and jealousy of strong government, and by making us feel safe to live under it makes for its better support. Without promise of a limiting Bill of Rights it is doubtful if our Constitution could have mustered enough strength to enable its ratification. To enforce those rights today is not to choose weak government over strong government. It is only to adhere as a means of strength to individual freedom of mind in preference to officially disciplined uniformity for which history indicates a disappointing and disastrous end * * *

“Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.

“It seems trite but necessary to say that the First Amendment

13. *Minersville School District v. Gobitis*, 310 U. S. 586, 60 Sup. Ct. 1010 (1939).

14. 319 U. S. 624, 63 Sup. Ct. 1178 (1943).

to our Constitution was designed to avoid these ends by avoiding these beginnings. * * *

"The action of Congress in making flag observance voluntary and respecting the conscience of the objector in a matter so vital as raising the Army contrasts sharply with these local regulations. * * *

"But freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

The trend away from extreme nationalism and particularly away from coerced national unity is obvious. It cannot be lightly disposed of in considering peacetime conscription, a form of coerced unity, to which there will be much more violent opposition than to wartime drafts.

Increased Protection of Individual Civil Rights.

One has only to read the six civil liberties cases decided by the United States Supreme Court at the October 1918 term¹⁵ and compare these with the most recent civil rights decisions of 1943-44 to sense the increased emphasis on protection of individual freedom even at some considerable risk to society. The steps by which this has been achieved can be traced: A liberal construction of the Bill of Rights in favor of the individual was first recognized.¹⁶ Then the power to abridge personal liberties became considered "the exception rather than the rule."¹⁷ Next the

15. See *Abrams v. United States*, 250 U. S. 616, 40 Sup. Ct. 17 (1919); *Schenck v. United States*, 249 U. S. 47, 39 Sup. Ct. 247 (1919); *Baer v. United States*, 249 U. S. 47, 39 Sup. Ct. 247 (1919); *Sugarman v. United States*, 249 U. S. 182, 39 Sup. Ct. 191 (1918); *Frohwerk v. United States*, 249 U. S. 204, 39 Sup. Ct. 249 (1918); *Debs v. United States*, 249 U. S. 211, 39 Sup. Ct. 252 (1918).

16. *Sgro v. United States*, 287 U. S. 206, 53 Sup. Ct. 138 (1932); *Grau v. United States*, 287 U. S. 124, 53 Sup. Ct. 38 (1932); *United States v. Lefkowitz*, 285 U. S. 452, 52 Sup. Ct. 420 (1931), and *Go-Bart Importing Co. v. United States*, 282 U. S. 344, 51 Sup. Ct. 153 (1930).

17. *Herndon v. Lowry*, 301 U. S. 242, 258, 57 Sup. Ct. 732, 739 (1936);

Court accepted the position that there is no presumption of constitutionality of an act claimed to infringe civil liberties.¹⁸ The Court rejected the test of "threatened danger in its incipency"¹⁹ and definitely required a "clear and present danger" before civil liberties could be restricted.²⁰ Such limitation on the *military* had always been the rule;²¹ here it was extended to the civil. Government was compelled to undergo some inconvenience or

DeJonge v. Oregon, 299 U. S. 353, 57 Sup. Ct. 255 (1936); and Lovell v. Griffin, 303 U. S. 444, 58 Sup. Ct. 666 (1937) and cases cited therein.

18. United States v. Carolene Products Co., 304 U. S. 144, 58 Sup. Ct. 778, 783 (1937); Schneider v. Irvington, 308 U. S. 147, 60 Sup. Ct. 146, 150 (1939); (1940) 40 COL. L. REV. 531, 532.

19. Gitlow v. New York, 268 U. S. 652, 45 Sup. Ct. 625 (1924).

20. Herndon v. Lowry, 301 U. S. 242, 57 Sup. Ct. 732 (1936). There are those who find a clear return to this rule as early as Fiske v. Kansas, 274 U. S. 380, 47 Sup. Ct. 655 (1927); Whitney v. California, 274 U. S. 357, 47 Sup. Ct. 641 (1927); and Near v. Minnesota, 283 U. S. 697, 51 Sup. Ct. 625 (1931).

21. Two cases involving the taking of property in time of war, on the claim that it was necessary in order to prevent its falling into the hands of the enemy, serve as illustrations. In United States v. Russell, 13 Wall. 623, 627-8 (U. S. 1871), the rule was stated as, "the public danger must be immediate, imminent, and impending, and the emergency in the public service must be extreme and imperative, and such as will not admit of delay or a resort to any other source of supply." In Mitchell v. Harmony, 13 How. 115 (U. S. 1851) since the evidence showed that the seizure was for the purpose of using the property in a forthcoming campaign, rather than to prevent the property coming into the enemy's possession, the plaintiff was allowed to recover against the military officer. The Court's language is very clear: "But in every such case the danger must be present or impending, and the necessity such as does not admit of delay or the intervention of the civil authority to provide the requisite means * * * he must also prove what the nature of the emergency was, or what he had reasonable grounds to believe it to be; and it will then be for the court and jury to say whether it was so pressing as to justify an invasion of private right." Sterling v. Constantin, 287 U. S. 378, 53 Sup. Ct. 190 (1932). "The absence of necessity for military order of the Governor * * * is established by showing that there was no actual uprising or showing of violence or anything more than threats of violence, breaches of the peace against oil producers, and that there was no closure of the courts or failure of civil authorities." Miller v. United States, 11 Wall. 268 (U. S. 1870); *Ex parte* Merryman, 17 Fed. Cas. 144, No. 9,487 (1861); *Ex parte* Vallandigham, 1 Wall. 243 (U. S. 1863); *Ex parte* Milligan, 4 Wall. 2 (U. S. 1866); 2 Black 635 (U. S. 1862). The majority, in the *Milligan* case, in a dictum denied Congress power to establish "martial law" except in case of actual, present invasion. The minority believed that Congress had the power in cases of "imminent public danger," "where ordinary law no longer adequately secures public safety and private rights."

inefficiency and undertake some danger and certain risks rather than cut down civil liberties.²² Religious freedom was given "every possible leeway."²³ Until finally, in the midst of this war, persons have been protected in their right to refuse to salute the flag, to criticize the government in its undertaking or waging the war.²⁴ This development has occurred *since* the Selective Draft Law Cases of 1917 and constitutes a restriction on those

22. *Schneider v. New Jersey*, 308 U. S. 147, 162-4, 60 Sup. Ct. 146, 152, 157 (1939) "* * * the public convenience * * * does not justify an exertion of the police power which invades the free communication of information and opinion secured by the Constitution." "* * * If it is said that these means are less efficient and convenient * * * the answer is that considerations of this sort do not empower a municipality to abridge freedom of speech and press." *See also*: *Mountain Timber Co. v. Washington*, 243 U. S. 219, 37 Sup. Ct. 260 (1925); *Weaver v. Palmer Brothers*, 270 U. S. 402, 46 Sup. Ct. 320 (1925); *Carlson v. California*, 310 U. S. 106, 60 Sup. Ct. 746 (1939); *Hague v. C. I. O.*, 307 U. S. 496, 59 Sup. Ct. 954 (1939); *Jehovah's Witness* cases of 1943, including *West Virginia State Bd. of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 63 Sup. Ct. 1178 (1943) and *Martin v. City of Struthers*, 319 U. S. 141, 63 Sup. Ct. 862 (1943); *Carlson v. California*, 310 U. S. 106, 60 Sup. Ct. 746 (1939); *Hague v. C. I. O.*, 307 U. S. 496, 59 Sup. Ct. 954 (1939) (Note that this approach stems back to earlier dissenting opinions); *Burns Baking Co. et al. v. Bryan*, 264 U. S. 504, 517, 520, 44 Sup. Ct. 412, 415, 416 (1924); and *Adams v. Tanner*, 244 U. S. 590, 597, 600, 37 Sup. Ct. 662, 665, 666 (1916). In *Thornhill v. Alabama*, 310 U. S. 88, 102, 60 Sup. Ct. 736, 744 (1939), although the Court recognized a present danger, it balanced the value of labor organization against internal order and employer's rights and found certain risks worth taking "in the circumstances of our times * * * [to preserve] the area of free discussion that is guaranteed by the Constitution." And in *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U. S. 444, 58 Sup. Ct. 666 (1937); *Schneider v. New Jersey* (and companion cases), 308 U. S. 147, 60 Sup. Ct. 146 (1939); *DeJonge v. Oregon*, 299 U. S. 353, 57 Sup. Ct. 255 (1936); *Hague v. C. I. O.*, 307 U. S. 496, 59 Sup. Ct. 954 (1939); *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U. S. 296, 60 Sup. Ct. 900 (1939) though it was clear that some "danger" or risk was present, the Court permitted free discussion to prevail. *See also*: *Bridges v. State of California*, 314 U. S. 252, 62 Sup. Ct. 190 (1941) and *Times-Mirror Co. v. Superior Court*, 314 U. S. 252, 62 Sup. Ct. 190 (1941).

See review of cases in Reisman, Civil Liberties in a Period of Transition (1942) 3 Public Policy 33-96.

23. *Minersville School District v. Gobitis*, 310 U. S. 586, 60 Sup. Ct. 1010 (1939). *See United States v. Ballard*, 88 L. Ed. (Adv.) 800 (1947), as an example of the extent of such protection, also note 24 *infra*.

24. *Taylor v. Mississippi*, 319 U. S. 583, 63 Sup. Ct. 1200 (1943); *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 63 Sup. Ct. 1178 (1943).

decisions rather than an expansion in the direction of upholding peacetime conscription.

Civil Power Is Supreme over Military.

Dean Roscoe Pound in a recent address, lists "five characteristics of our Anglo-American law * * * (1) * * * supremacy of law * * * (2) *subordination of the military to the civil power* * * * (3) * * * emergencies do not suspend the constitution * * * (4) there are fundamental individual rights, guaranteed and protected by the constitutions * * * (5) * * * the constitutions set up and the courts maintain a separation of powers."²⁵ We need not go back to English precedent, though persuasive authority may also there be found. Our Declaration of Independence stated the eleventh justification for overthrowing a "government * * * destructive of these ends" for which "governments are instituted among men" as "he (it) has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to the civil power." It was "Lord Dunmore's proclamation declaring his intention to execute martial law in that province" (Virginia) which caused the first representative government to be created in this country.²⁶ The change of wording in the proposed Constitution from "*make war*" to "*declare war*" was expressly for the purpose of "clogging rather than facilitating war; but for facilitating peace."²⁷ The provision that no appropriation for military expenses should be for a longer period than two years was added to the constitution so that "the military shall always be subordinate to the civil power."²⁸ The debates in the constitutional convention reflected this attitude²⁹ and nearly every state in ratifying the constitution

25. Pound, *War and the Law* (1943) 14 PA. BAR ASS'N Q. 110, 112-113.

26. 1 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 52.

27. DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (1894-1905) 553, 554; 1 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 246; 5 *Ibid.* 443.

28. 1 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 249; 5 *Ibid.* 445; WARREN, THE MAKING OF THE CONSTITUTION (1928) 504-505.

29. Note 27 *supra*; 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 343, 443, 445, 447, 467, 511, 544-5; 1 *Ibid.* 248-9, and 2 FARRAND, RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787 (1937) 334, 341.

placed the same interpretation on the constitutional plan.³⁰ The New York ratification contains a typical statement: "at all times the military should be under strict subordination to the civil power."³¹ From the earliest times, both in England³² and in the United States,³³ the courts refused to accept the decision of the military and insisted on making an independent decision of the necessity for any military action infringing individual liberties and consistently refused to permit military law and military authority to be applied where civil law and civil authority was still operating.³⁴

Other Rules of Interpretation.

The Supreme Court has so often repeated the rule that war does not abolish constitutional protections and that emergency

30. Rhode Island in its ratification declared: "at all times the military should be under strict subordination to the civil power." 1 WARREN, *op. cit. supra* note 28, at 336. The whole history of the ratification of the Constitution is one of insistence upon the inclusion of a Bill of Rights, the fear that central government would be too strong, the release of the *militia* from martial law except in time of war. Any opposition to these protections was not based on their undesirability but on the assertion that under our system of *delegated* powers no supremacy of the military, no infringement of basic rights, no usurpation of power could occur. 1 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 325, 327, 334 ff.; 2 *Ibid.* 32, 80, 123, 220, 251, 269, 316, 359, 398, 429, 435, 449, 455, 545 ff.; 3 *Ibid.* 32, 317, 445, 449, 502, 649, 651, 660, are typical examples. See Madison's remarks, 1st Cong., 1st Sess., June 8, 1789; also WARREN, *op. cit. supra* note 28, at 508, 769. See also quoted statements in Cong. Record, appendix, vol. 86, pt. 17, pp. 5206 ff. by Lawyers Committee to Keep the United States out of War. CHAFEE, FREE SPEECH IN THE UNITED STATES (1941) 30; "The first ten amendments were drafted by men who had just been through a war." Randall in CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS UNDER LINCOLN (1926) 26: "The law of military necessity, however, is not the typical American principle. To say that military force is not to be restrained by the superior power of law, is to quote the militaristic view as against that which has always prevailed here."

Many of the state constitutions contain provisions assuring the supremacy of the civil power.

31. 1 Warren, *op. cit. supra* note 28, 237.

32. The case of the Bristol Rights (S. T. U. S. III, 2-56), 1932, cited in 3 WILLOUGHBY, THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW OF THE UNITED STATES (2d ed. 1929) 1591.

33. Mitchell v. Harmony, 13 How. 115 (U. S. 1851). See also note 21 *supra*.

34. See note 21 *supra* and the recent case of Hammond v. Squier, 51 F. Supp. 227 (W. D. Wash., 1943).

cannot create power, that the question should by now be foreclosed from debate.³⁵

Although we could trace from the very beginnings of our government the unflinching adherence to the rule that the federal government has no inherent but only delegated powers and must function within those delegated, it is only necessary to cite four recent decisions.³⁶

35. *Ex parte* Quirin, 317 U. S. 1, 63 Sup. Ct. 1 (1942); *Schechter v. United States*, 295 U. S. 495, 528, 55 Sup. Ct. 837, 842 (1934); *Home Building and Loan Association v. Blaisdell*, 290 U. S. 398, 54 Sup. Ct. 231 (1933); *Highland v. Russell Car Co.*, 279 U. S. 253, 261, 49 Sup. Ct. 314, 316 (1928); *United States v. Cohen Grocery Co.*, 255 U. S. 81, 88, 41 Sup. Ct. 298, 299 (1920); *Hamilton v. Kentucky Distilleries Co.*, 251 U. S. 146, 155, 40 Sup. Ct. 106, 108 (1919); *Ex parte* Milligan, 4 Wall. 2 (U. S. 1866).

36. In *United States v. Butler*, 297 U. S. 1, 56 Sup. Ct. 312 (1936), the court said:

"From the accepted doctrine that the United States is a government of delegated powers, it follows that those not expressly granted, or reasonably to be implied from such as are conferred, are reserved to the states or to the people. To forestall any suggestion to the contrary, the Tenth Amendment was adopted. The same proposition, otherwise stated, is that powers not granted are prohibited."

Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U. S. 238, 291, 56 Sup. Ct. 855 (1936):

"The proposition, often advanced and as often discredited, that the power of the federal government inherently extends to purposes affecting the nation as a whole with which the states severally cannot deal or cannot adequately deal, and the related notion that Congress, entirely apart from those powers delegated by the Constitution, may enact laws to promote the general welfare, have never been accepted but always definitely rejected by this court."

Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U. S. 495, 528, 55 Sup. Ct. 837 (1934):

"Those who act under these grants are not at liberty to transcend the imposed limits because they believe that more or different power is necessary."

Home Bldg. & L. Ass'n v. Blaisdell, 290 U. S. 398, 425, 54 Sup. Ct. 231 (1934):

"Emergency does not create power. Emergency does not increase granted power or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted or reserved. The Constitution was adopted in a period of grave emergency. Its grants of power to the Federal Government and its limitations of the power of the States were determined in the light of emergency and they are not altered by emergency. What power was thus granted and what limitations were thus imposed are questions which have always been, and always will be, the subject of close examination under our constitutional system."

The nearest the Supreme Court has ever come to recognizing "inherent" power is *U. S. v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation*, 299 U. S. 304, 57 Sup. Ct. 216 (1936), and that is a "delegated" and "incidental" power case. *See*

Other general principles of constitutional construction to be applied are fairly well agreed upon: the court attempts to place itself as nearly as possible in the position of the men who framed the instrument and to define powers in accordance with underlying principles and purposes.³⁷ To this end, references to the *Federalist*, the debates in the constitutional convention, the ratifications in the several states are helpful.³⁸ But any particular person's view in debate is not of great moment, nor is any proposed amendment, not ratified, unless it be clear that more than a personal or minority point of view is represented.³⁹ Where no exceptions to a general power are stated in the Constitution none will be found by mere implication or construction. Yet constitutional provisions are of equal dignity; none must be disregarded and none must be so enforced as to nullify or substantially impair other provisions.⁴⁰ Whether the framers of the Constitution were or were not familiar with a certain subject matter is not determinative of the application of constitutional provisions thereto.⁴¹

Patterson, *In re the United States v. Curtis Wright Corporation* (1944) 22 TEX. L. REV. 286; Quarles, *Federal Government: as to Foreign Affairs, Are Its Powers Inherent as Distinguished from Delegated?* (1944) 32 GEO. L. J. 375; BEARD, *THE REPUBLIC* (1943) 273 for severe criticisms of the "inherent power" dictum of this case.

37. *Re Bain*, 121 U. S. 1, 7 Sup. Ct. 781 (1886); *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 16 Pet. 539 (U. S. 1842); *M'Culloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316 (U. S. 1819); *Craig v. Missouri*, 4 Pet. 410 (U. S. 1830); *United States v. Lefkowitz*, 285 U. S. 452, 52 Sup. Ct. 420 (1931); *Fairbank v. United States*, 181 U. S. 283, 21 Sup. Ct. 648 (1900).

38. *Cohen v. Virginia*, 6 Wheat. 264 (U. S. 1821); *Wheeling, P. & C. Transp. Co. v. Wheeling*, 99 U. S. 273 (1878); *Ex parte Grossman*, 267 U. S. 87, 45 Sup. Ct. 332 (1924); *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 4 Wheat. 518 (U. S. 1819); Justice Frankfurter in *United States v. Monia*, 317 U. S. 424, 431, 63 Sup. Ct. 409, 412 (1943).

39. *Maxwell v. Dow*, 176 U. S. 581, 20 Sup. Ct. 448 (1899); *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U. S. 649, 18 Sup. Ct. 456 (1897).

40. *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1 (U. S. 1824); *Rhode Island v. Massachusetts*, 12 Pet. 657 (U. S. 1838); *Myers v. United States*, 272 U. S. 52, 47 Sup. Ct. 21 (1926); *United States v. Butler*, 297 U. S. 1, 56 Sup. Ct. 312 (1935); *Wright v. United States*, 302 U. S. 583, 58 Sup. Ct. 395 (1937); *Dick v. United States*, 208 U. S. 340, 28 Sup. Ct. 399 (1907); *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137 (U. S. 1803).

41. *United States v. Classic*, 313 U. S. 299, 61 Sup. Ct. 1031 (1940).

Cases on Conscription.

The two cases which specifically upheld the constitutionality of wartime conscription are *Kneedler v. Lane*,⁴² a Pennsylvania case decided during the War between the States and the *Selective Draft Law Cases*⁴³ of World War I. Other cases merely follow these; largely without reexamination of the issues and arguments. In the *Kneedler* case on the first hearing (temporary injunction) the court by a vote of 3 to 2 held conscription unconstitutional. The basis of the decision was: the federal government is a government of delegated powers; the Constitution must be taken as a whole and effect be given to every part; to grant power of general conscription under the 13th clause of Art. I, Sec. 8, "to raise and support armies," would destroy the 16th and 17th clauses which prescribed when the militia could be called out and how they were to be trained; the background of the constitutional convention showed an intention to limit "the power to raise armies to (by) the ordinary English mode of voluntary enlistments"; it could not be claimed that the power "to provide and maintain a Navy" authorized the "press-gang"; the claimed power was contrary to the whole "nature or genius of the government which the constitution formed"; if the power was "proper" it was not "necessary", under the necessary and proper clause, for the militia had not been called out and voluntary enlistments had not been exhausted. These propositions had previously been forcefully stated by Daniel Webster in opposition to and defeat of an earlier plan of limited wartime conscription.⁴⁴

On a second hearing, the constituency of the court having been changed by the election of Judge Agnew to replace Chief Justice Lowrie, the law was sustained, 3 to 2. Since Judge Agnew's

42. 45 Pa. St. 238 (1863).

43. 245 U. S. 366, 38 Sup. Ct. 159 (1917). I am not analyzing either *Sugar v. U. S.*, 252 Fed. 74 (C. C. A. 6th, 1918), which contains a good consideration of the same law or *U. S. v. Olsen*, 253 Fed. 233 (W. D. Wash., 1917), a less satisfactory analysis.

44. 14 WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF DANIEL WEBSTER 55-69. See also Chief Justice Chaney's opinion of the unconstitutionality of conscription, published by Philip G. Auchampaugh, University of Nevada in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (1936), vol. XVIII, pp. 72-87; Rep. Chandler and others speaking on the amendment of the Conscription Act in 1865; 37th Cong. 3rd Sess.

opinion was the deciding one his arguments should be examined. His reasoning runs thus: (1) there is a presumption of constitutionality; (2) the power to "declare" war presupposes the right to "make" war which is an *inherent* power of all sovereign nations and this "inherently carries with it the power to coerce or draft"; (3) the clause, "to raise and support armies" is unlimited; (4) power to draft must lie either in the Federal government or the State and since the State cannot use it for national purposes it must belong to the United States; (5) the militia power is an additional power subsidiary to the power to raise armies. But we have seen that there is no presumption of constitutionality of this type of law which cuts down individual civil liberties; the word "declare" was specifically substituted for "make" war in order to restrict the military power; even if we concede that in international law sovereign nations have the inherent power to raise armies by any means,⁴⁵ yet we are considering the extent of the power of the state and of the federal government *under a specific Constitution* which deprives the federal government of all inherent power. As can thus be seen from other portions of this article, the judicial soundness of most of the propositions relied upon is open to considerable question and there is basis for saying that Lincoln thought of his action as calling out the militia.⁴⁶

It appears from the *Kneedler* case that the Pennsylvania court desired to have the case decided by the United States Supreme Court but that the government studiously avoided this.^{46a} A more closely reasoned case was decided under the Constitution of the Confederacy in 1862, *Jeffers v. Fair*.^{46b} Although this cannot be an authoritative interpretation of the federal constitution, the provisions considered are the same as in the United States Constitution. The Court placed almost its entire reliance on the fact that "to raise and support armies was unqualified" and therefore, at least in wartime, was unrestricted by the militia clause.

45. 3 Vattel, *THE LAW OF NATIONS*, c. 2, secs. 8 & 9 (1916); BURLAMAQUI, *THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL LAW* (Ed. 1791) Part IV, c. 1, Sec. XII.

46. See notes 18, 27, 36, *supra*.

46a. Perhaps because of Chief Justice Chaney's opinion referred to *supra*, note 44.

46b. 33 Ga. 347 (1862).

The *Selective Draft Law* cases, although referring to the *Kneedler* case as controlling authority, completely reexamined the issue.⁴⁷ There are some who find in the court's opinion the attitude which Shakespeare made famous in the words: "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." For the court's argument is constantly advanced by this type of wording: "cannot conceive", "too frivolous for further notice", "so devoid of foundation", "not even a shadow of ground", "to do more than state the proposition is absolutely unnecessary", "unnecessary to follow", "wholly unnecessary to explore", "cannot be the slightest doubt", "it is indisputable", "fallacy of the argument", etc. Whether this be true or not, it is true that the court does not work out a consistent interrelation of the various military powers set forth in the Constitution. The Court's reasoning may be outlined as follows: The colonies had the right to enforce military service; the states enforced military service; one of the reasons for calling the Constitutional Convention was the inadequacy under the Confederation of depending on the states to fill military quotas; a state citizen can't volunteer for the federal army if he cannot also be drafted; the relation between the militia clause and the clause "to raise and support armies" was "there was left therefore under the sway of the States undelegated the control of the militia to the extent that such control was not taken away by the exercise by Congress of its power to raise armies;" "the power granted to Congress to raise armies in its potentiality was susceptible of narrowing the area over which the militia clause operated," and that the obligation of the citizens to the federal government was direct rather than through the states by virtue of the 14th amendment.^{47a}

Neither of these cases do, nor could they, pass on the peace-

47. Perhaps the court did not have to pass on the broad constitutional question, since the charge was refusal to register and it has been pointed out that a person may be required to register whether or not he could be conscripted: *Stone v. Christensen*, 36 F. Supp. 739, D. Ore. (1940); *U. S. v. Rappeport*, 36 F. Supp. 915 S. D. N. Y. (1941), *affd.* 120 F. (2d) 236 (C. C. A. 2d, 1941).

47a. 245 U. S. 366, 378-383, 38 Sup. Ct. 159, 161-163 (1918). The question whether a new "United States citizenship" was created by the 14th amendment is a study in itself which will not be attempted here. Suffice it to say, I find nothing in the amendment, congressional debates, or decisions, to show an intention to create a federal militia power.

time conscription by the federal government of men, the drafting of women, or the drafting of conscientious objectors. This last point was incidentally raised by the defendants in the *Selective Draft Law* cases, none of whom were conscientious objectors, by asserting that discriminatory preference was granted to objectors. The government urged that the exemption was in furtherance of the right of religious freedom and apparently the court accepted this position:

"The law neither establishes a religion nor prohibits its free exercise. Section 4 contains nothing respecting the establishment of religion; on the contrary, it goes so far as to aid in the free exercise of those religions which forbid participation in war. * * *

"Exemptions were allowed by every compulsory service law passed by the States. Quakers and conscientious objectors were frequently exempted in the Revolutionary War. (Citing many acts of the States)." ^{47b}

The 1940 selective service law might be considered (prior to Pearl Harbor) as peacetime conscription, though there is strong authority in International Law that we were at war prior to October 1940, due to the acts of the President.⁴⁸ Few cases arose prior to Pearl Harbor. Eight Union Theological students refused to register, pleaded guilty, did not challenge the act and were each sentenced to a year and a day.⁴⁹ Later five young men refused to register, filed demurrers attacking the act's constitutionality, were tried and sentenced to eighteen months to two years each.⁵⁰ Several other cases followed. In all of the reported cases, the courts, in upholding the conviction of persons for refusing to register, either held that war existed though there

47b. 245 U. S. at 374 (1918).

48. Wright, *When Does War Exist?* (1932) 26 Am. Jour. of Int. Law 362; McNair, *The Legal Meaning of War*, (1926) 11 Grotius Soc. Trans. 29; Brierly, *International Law and Resort to Armed Force*, (1932) 4 Camb. L. J. 308; 1 Hackworth, *Digest on International Law*, State Dept., (1941), 660-663; 6 *Id.* 489-503; 7 *Ibid.* 390-396, 425-430, 488-503, 687-693, 703-5.

49. N. Y. Times, Nov. 15, 1940, p. 1.

50. N. Y. Times, Feb. 12, 1941, pp. 14, 15; N. Y. Herald Tribune, December 4, 1940; Philadelphia Record, December 12, 1940; *United States v. Rapoport*, 36 F. Supp. 915 (S. D. N. Y., 1941), *affd.* 120 F. (2d) 236 (C. C. A. 2d, 1941).

was no "formal declaration of war"⁵¹ or they held that the case involved only refusal to register, which could be compelled as a census in time of peace or war.⁵² Those cases in which the charge was refusal to report for induction occurred after Pearl Harbor.⁵³ Therefore, none of these cases had to pass on the Constitutionality of peacetime conscription; yet, nearly every case contained an assertion of the validity of such conscription. We have pointed out elsewhere other dicta to the same effect.

The Supreme Court has been careful in some cases upholding the broadest military powers in wartime, to caution that its words should not be extended to peacetime.⁵⁴

It would seem that the right to use, in time of war or after attack, federal troops—volunteer or conscript—abroad has been foreclosed by the courts. In *Cox v. Wood*,⁵⁵ "petitioner, after affirming the validity of said Conscription Act of May 18, 1917, pleads what he calls his constitutional immunity from mili-

51. *United States v. Rappeport*, *supra* note 50; *United States v. Lambert*, 123 F. (2d) 395 (C. C. A. 3d, 1941); *United States v. Cornell*, 36 F. Supp. 81 (D. Idaho 1940).

52. *United States v. Rappeport*, *supra* note 50; *Stone v. Christensen*, *supra* note 47; *United States v. Garst*, 39 F. Supp. 367 (E. D. Pa., 1941). "Congress undoubtedly has the power to seek information through registration or otherwise in peacetime, in order to be prepared for the intelligent exercise of its power to raise armies by conscription even if its power to conscript can be exercised only in time of war." 36 F. Supp. at 917 (S. D. N. Y. 1941).

53. See Annotation, 147 A. L. R. 1185, 1313ff and subsequent annotations.

54. Justice Cardozo, *Hamilton v. Bd. of Regents*, 293 U. S. 245, 55 Sup. Ct. 197 (1934): "There is no occasion at this time to mark the limits of governmental power in the exaction of military service when the nation is at peace."

United States v. Macintosh, 283 U. S. 605, 622, 51 Sup. Ct. 570, 574 (1931): "other drastic powers, wholly inadmissible in time of peace, exercised to meet the emergencies of war."

55. 247 U. S. 3, 4, 6, 38 Sup. Ct. 421, 422 (1917). This position continues to be asserted, however; see record and brief, *Pacman v. U. S.*, 144 F. (2d) 562 (C. C. A. 9th, 1944), *cert. filed* U. S. Supreme Court, October 1944. A distinction has been recognized between the *emergency preceding war* when service is restricted within the United States and possessions, 50 U. S. C. A. § 303 (e) (Supp. 1943) and *war* when territorial restrictions are abolished, 50 U. S. C. A. § 731 (Supp. 1943). Also the right to "drive back" as part of "repel" was early advanced, 4 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 459: "If it became necessary for the executive to call out the militia to repel invasion, he thought they might pursue the enemy beyond the limits, until the invaders were effectively dispersed."

tary service beyond the territorial limits of the United States." The Court held that there was no such immunity. In so holding it stated that the power "to compel military service * * * derived from the authority * * * to declare war and to raise armies" which was "not qualified or restricted by the provisions of the militia clause." Whether this reasoning is sound or not, the court could also have upheld service abroad under the provisions of the militia clause on the ground that "to repel" includes to "drive back" and that "invasion" included attack upon our ships which international law recognizes as "floating islands." These cases, then, constitute the United States Supreme Court's present outline of the powers of conscription.

Background of the Constitutional Provisions.

At the beginning of this article we set forth the constitutional provisions from which federal authority or lack of authority to compel peacetime conscription must be found. One misapprehension, entertained by far too many people, should be dispelled—that is that the words: "to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" constitute a granting of a *power* to the federal government.⁵⁶ These words are found only in the Preamble and in Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1 which grants federal taxing and spending powers. The cases are clear, and constitutional authorities are agreed that the Preamble creates no power and these words in Article I constitute *limitations* on the government's money raising and spending power, not grants.⁵⁷

We have pointed out that in our system of government the civil is supreme over the military, that our Constitution sought to clog war "making" and that we must determine the meaning and interrelation of all the provisions in the Constitution relating to war and the military.

56. Even the Lawyers Committee to Keep the United States out of War cited this as a source of Congressional war power. See 86 Cong. Rec. (March, 1940) appendix, pt. 17, 5206 ff.

57. United States v. Butler, 297 U. S. 1, 56 Sup. Ct. 12 (1936); Helvering v. Davis, 301 U. S. 619, 57 Sup. Ct. 904 (1937); United States v. Boyer, 85 Fed. 425, 432 (W. D. Mo., 1898), quoting Story on the Constitution. See the excellent specific discussion by Madison, FARRAND, THE RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION (1937) 483-494; Gebelein, Inc. v. Milbourne, 12 F. Supp. 105 (D. Md. 1935); The Federalist No. XLI.

(a) Standing Armies.

One of the grievances set forth in our Declaration of Independence as a justification for overthrowing government was: "He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies * * *". In England there had been a long opposition to standing armies. They were condemned in the Petition of Right in 1628 and the Bill of Rights; they were branded as dangerous and contrary to the theory of government in Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England. Parliament had developed the militia system and disbanded in peacetime the whole King's army.⁵⁸ We inherited and carried on this opposition in the United States. The continental army of 10,000 was furloughed by Congress within two months after the war ended, even though a British army was still in the country and it had already violated the treaty of peace.⁵⁹ In the Constitutional Convention no voice was raised to defend a large standing army; even those who spoke for greater military power merely desired a small volunteer army or a well organized militia. Madison, in urging the states to federate and not to fall apart, did so on the basis that it would prevent large standing armies:

"In time of actual war, great discretionary powers are constantly given to the Executive Magistrate. Constant apprehension of War, has the same tendency to render the head too large for the body. A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defence agst. foreign danger, have been always the instruments of tyranny at home. Among the Romans it was a standing maxim to excite a war, whenever a revolt was apprehended. Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people."⁶⁰

Several attempts were made to limit the standing army to *two*

58. 1 BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES (15th ed., 1809) 408 ff.; 3 MAY, CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND (1912 ed.) 281; 1 LECKY, HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE 18TH CENTURY (5th ed., 1891) 508.

59. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 87, 89, 90. Congress was quick to put an end to enlistments as soon as the Massachusetts "rebellion" was ended. *Ibid.* 94, 99.

60. 1 FARRAND, THE RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION (1937) 465.

thousand.⁶¹ The first voice heard upon the discussion of the military power was Mr. Gerry's "against standing armies in time of peace * * * The people were jealous on this head."⁶² The last voices to speak on the military power, Col. Mason, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Madison, were:

"sensible that an absolute prohibition of standing armies in time of peace might be unsafe, and wish (ed), at the same time, to insert something pointing out and guarding against the danger of them."⁶³

At this time a provision to preface the militia clause (Art. I, Sec. 8) reading "and that the liberties of the people may be better secured against the danger of standing armies in time of peace," was rejected "as setting a dishonorable mark of distinction on the military class of citizens."

Although there was general agreement with the basic plan for a small army, it was recognized that "a standing force of some sort may * * * become unavoidable," and that "limiting the appropriation of revenue (might be) the best guard in this case."⁶⁴ This was an acceptance of the point of view of Mr. Pinckney who introduced a resolution that "no troops shall be kept up in time of peace, but by consent of the Legislature"⁶⁵ and that of Hamilton, strongly stated in the *Federalist*, that the protection against peacetime standing armies had been and could be best lodged in the legislature.⁶⁶

It appears therefore that, while this did not meet the whole

61. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 443. Other limitations proposed but rejected will be found in 2 FARRAND, THE RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION (1937) 323, 329, 330, 333, 563, 616, 617, 640, 4 *Ibid.* 59.

62. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 443.

63. 5 *Ibid.* 442-4.

64. 5 *Ibid.* 544, 545. And "Madison was in favor of it. It did not restrain Congress from establishing a military force in time of peace, if found necessary; and as armies in time of peace are allowed, on all hands, to be an evil, it is well to discountenance them by the Constitution, as far as will consist with the essential power of the government on that head."

65. 2 FARRAND, THE RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION (1937) 341.

66. The *Federalist*, No. XXVI, No. XXIV. Hamilton, the most consistent advocate of strong federal powers, favored "a certain portion of military force" yet seemed to fear too much use of "a federal standing army." 1 FARRAND, THE RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION (1937) 285; 2 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 232-3.

opposition of all members, the provision "but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years" was added to the phrase "to raise and support armies" as some "restriction on the number and continuance of an army in time of peace."⁶⁷

When the Constitution was submitted to the states for ratification each convention recorded its opposition to any interpretation which would permit large federal standing armies.⁶⁸ Nearly every state attached interpretations or conditions to their ratification of the Constitution to prevent large standing armies and some even demanded amendment.⁶⁹ Mr. Randolph addressed the House of Representatives on January 5, 1800 and obtained a reduction of the standing army (which was not over 3000 men).

"I suppose the establishment of a standing army in the country not only a useless and enormous expense, but, upon the

67. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 510-11; 2 FARRAND, *op. cit. supra* note 29, 509.

68. Typical expressions from the State Debates are collected in Cong. Rec. appendix, vol. 86, pt. 17, pp. 5206 ff.

Massachusetts: *General Thompson*, "Keep your militia in order—we don't want standing armies."

Mr. Nason: "Suffer me, Sir, to say a few words on the fatal effects of standing armies, that bane of republican governments. * * *"

Virginia: *George Mason*, "But when once a standing army is established, in any country the people lose their liberty."

Madison: "A standing army is one of the greatest mischiefs that can possibly happen."

Governor Randolph: "With respect to a standing army, I believe there was not a member in the federal convention who did not feel indignation at such an institution."

Similar remarks were made by Patrick Henry, Mr. Dawson and others.

69. Cong. Rec. appendix, vol. 86, pt. 17, pp. 5206 ff.

New Hampshire: "no standing army shall be kept up in time of peace, unless with the consent of three-fourths of the members of each branch of Congress. * * *"

New York: "standing armies in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be kept up, except in cases of necessity. * * *"

North Carolina: "no standing army or regular troops shall be raised or kept up, in time of peace without the consent of two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives."

Rhode Island: "standing armies, in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be kept up, except in cases of necessity."

Most State Constitutions contained provisions against standing armies. These generally left the protection to the legislatures. The Federalist No. XXIV, footnote.

ground of the Constitution, the spirit of that instrument and the genius of a free people are equally hostile to this dangerous institution, which ought to be resorted to (if at all) only in extreme cases of difficulty and danger, * * *⁷⁰

From the foregoing it is clear that it cannot be contended that there is a constitutional proscription of standing armies or even that there is a specific constitutional limitation on their size. The people entrusted their protection against large standing armies in time of peace to their legislature with as strong *instructions* as could be made that the legislators should use the power of the purse to keep the army small. If therefore the legislature should authorize too large a peacetime standing army, this would not be a specific constitutional breach but at most a violation by the legislators of their oath. (Constitution, Art. VI) How large is a "small" army? There were 10,000 troops at the close of the Revolution—these were practically all furloughed and later discharged. In 1898 the army was composed of 25,000 men; in 1910 the regular army numbered 83,000; in 1920 about 298,000; in 1930 approximately 130,750; in 1940, *existing* 255,000—to be built to 375,000—plus 230,000 national guard. These compare with standing armies in Germany (1937) 556,000; Russia (1932) 562,000, and Japan (1936) 260,000.⁷¹

(b) The State Militia.

Our forefathers did more than face the problem of standing armies and record their opposition thereto; they attempted to work out alternatives.

The history of the Continental Congress and of the Confederation and the reason which dictated a change of form are so well known as to require no citation. Congress had no authority to compel the furnishing of troops or money. It could fix quotas for the colonies or States and request that they fill these. That the States had not done. It was therefore proposed to give the federal government some additional power in those fields. On

70. 4 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 441.

71. Reliance has been placed on *League of Nations Armament Yearbook*; BOND, OUR MILITARY POLICY (1932); WALDROP, MACARTHUR ON WAR (1942); CHAMBERLIN, SOVIET RUSSIA (1930). There is at present no statutory limitation on the size of the Army: 50 U. S. C. A. § 762 (Supp. 1942).

August 20, 1870, General Washington wrote the President of Congress strongly pointing out that the existing plan had provided an inadequate supply of men and materials.⁷² In 1781 he wrote to John Park Curtis (Virginia):⁷³

"The great business of war can never be well conducted, if it can be conducted at all, while the powers of Congress are only recommendatory; while one State yields obedience and another refuses it, while a third mutilates and adopts the measure in part only, and all vary in time and manner, * * *"

The first plan submitted, May 29, 1787, the "Randolph Resolutions" contained this reference:

"that the National Legislature ought to be impowered * * * to call forth the forces of the Union agst. any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duty under the articles thereof." ⁷⁴

This was followed by the Pinckney plan. As submitted to the convention it authorized the legislature:

"To raise armies; To build and equip fleets; To pass laws for arming, organizing, and disciplining the militia of the *United States*." and "To call forth the aid of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, enforce treaties, suppress insurrection and repel invasion." ⁷⁵

Had these provisions been adopted rather than those later embodied in the Constitution, and had the provision "to *make war*" remained, and had no qualification been placed alongside "to raise armies," it might have been clear that the federal government had authority to call forth (draft, conscript) the *federal* militia (complete United States manpower) and place them in armies. For, by definition, the creation of a *federal* militia would have made all American citizens liable to federal military service. But even then it would have been extremely difficult to argue that the right could be exercised for other than the four enumerated purposes or that the men could be trained other than as a "militia." A constitutionally consistent plan under the

72. VILES, GEORGE WASHINGTON, LETTERS AND ADDRESSES (1909) 215.

73. 7 SPARK'S, WRITINGS OF WASHINGTON (1833-1837) 442.

74. 1 FARRAND, *op. cit. supra* note 29, 21.

75. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 130.

Pinckney proposal would have had to interpret the power "to raise armies" and the power to organize and call forth "the militia of the United States" together. This could only have been done by recognizing three rules:

- (1) All able bodied men, not exempt, are liable to federal military training and service (definition of militia).
- (2) These men could be *compelled* to serve only for the four stated purposes.
- (3) But armies could be raised *by any other method than compulsion*, and used for the four stated purposes *or otherwise*.

It is of paramount importance to examine the Convention record to determine whether this first proposal for federal power was extended or restricted.

No one knew better than Washington, who had urged broad federal powers, that the power had been definitely restricted. In the letter, approved by the Convention, by which Washington transmitted the Constitution as finally adopted, he said:

"The friends of our country have long seen and desired that the power of *making war*, peace, and treaties; that of *levying money* and regulating commerce; and the correspondent executive and judicial authorities, shall be fully and effectually vested in the general government of the Union. But the impropriety of delegating such extensive trust to one body of men is evident. *Thence results the necessity of a different organization.*"⁷⁶

At no point was this change more marked than with regard to the military powers, and particularly the militia. In the long debates it became clear that there was not and was not to be such a thing as a *United States* militia (general manpower obligated to military service); that the militia was to be that of the states and under major control by the states.⁷⁷ Even a resolution to

76. 1 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 305; the changes can even be seen by comparing the amendments in the Committee on Detail: 2 FARRAND, *op. cit. supra* note 29, 135, 143-45, 158-9, 167-9, 3 *Ibid.* 607.

77. U. S. CONST. Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 17; U. S. CONST. Art. II, Sec. 2, "The President shall be Commander in Chief * * * of the *Militia of the several States*, when called into the actual Service of the United States." This is recognized in R. O. T. C. Manual, 2nd year advanced, Vol. IV, c. 1921-26. George Washington continued to refer to "the militia of the U. S." in a com-

give the federal government power to "make laws for the regulation and discipline of the militia of the several states, reserving to the states the appointment of the officers" "went too far."⁷⁸ A proposal reserving to the states only the right to appoint "officers under the rank of *general officers*" called forth a blistering attack as "absolutely inadmissible" so that the resolution was not even seconded.⁷⁹ All reference to a United States militia was dropped and the militia was definitely referred to as that of the states.

Although all agreed that the states would not surrender up the militia, it was recognized that some uniformity of organization and arms was desirable.⁸⁰ When the present provision was submitted to the Convention by the committee of eleven, Madison urged this militia plan: "as the greatest danger to liberty is from standing armies, it is best to prevent them by an effective provision for a good militia."⁸¹ Immediately following this the present constitutional provision was adopted, but only after Mr. King, a member of the committee, had set down on the record the intended extent of the federal authority:

"by way of explanation, said, that by *organizing*, the committee meant, proportioning the officers and men—by *arming*, specifying the kind, size, and calibre of arms—and by *disciplining*, prescribing the manual exercise; evolutions, &c."

munication to Congress, August 7, 1789; 30 SPARKS, WRITINGS OF GEORGE WASHINGTON (1833-1837) 372. And General Marshall seems to fall into the same error as Washington in justification for conscription. (82 *Army & Navy Journal* 32.)

78. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 443.

79. *Ibid.* 466.

80. *Ibid.* 443-445; 2 FARRAND, *op. cit. supra* note 29, 324, 326, 331, 332.

81. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 466-7. Governor Randolph made even clearer the importance of the state militia as a compromise between no defence and the creation of large federal armies:

"With respect to a standing army, I believe there was not a member in the federal convention who did not feel indignation at such an institution. What remedy then could be provided?—Leave the country defenceless? In order to provide for our defence, and exclude the dangers of a standing army, the general defence is left to those who are the objects of defence. It is left to the militia who will suffer if they become the instruments of tyranny. The general government must have power to call them forth when the general defence requires it. In order to produce greater security, the state governments are to appoint the officers." 3 FARRAND, *op. cit. supra* n. 29, 319. See WALDROP, MACARTHUR ON WAR (1942) 91-92.

“added to his former explanation, that *arming* meant not only to provide for uniformity of arms, but included the authority to regulate the modes of furnishing, either by the militia themselves, the state governments, or the national treasury; that *laws* for disciplining must involve penalties and every thing necessary for enforcing penalties.”⁸²

It therefore appears that the first rule which we stated as deducible from the Pinckney proposal was denied to the federal government and recognized in the states:

1. Only to the states do the able-bodied men owe the obligation of military training and service (militia) except as they are called into the federal service for the three purposes enumerated.

(a) The Phrase, “To Raise * * * Armies”

Leaving out of account the relation of the power to the militia provisions, there is some evidence that the authority “to raise and support armies” was considered to be unrestricted (at least as to numbers); other evidence points to the power being limited to recruitment by voluntary enlistment (except as the militia could be called). Hamilton, strongest advocate of unlimited federal power, in the *Federalist*, No. XXIII said: “These powers (including raising armies) ought to exist without limitation.” He went on, in the same paper, to interpret the provision as authorizing raising armies “in the customary and ordinary modes practised in other governments.” There is strong implication in the *Federalist* No. XXVI that in time of peace Hamilton did not have in mind anything but volunteers for he said:

“an army, so large as seriously to menace those liberties, could only be formed by progressive augmentations.”

Since, if conscription is possible, the army could be raised to any size at one time, his argument assumes progressive enlistment controlled by successive Congresses’ power of purse. At another point Hamilton seems to speak for an indefinite power to raise troops in war or peace, yet immediately follows it by a condemnation of a large army which “may be fatal.”^{82a}

82. 5 ELLIOT’S DEBATES (1876) 464-5.

82a. The *Federalist*, No. XLI.

There is no reference, either in the debates or in the writings of those who urged an unlimited interpretation of the power "to raise armies" to suggest that they had in mind or intended to urge conscription. Nor is there any clear cut reference to restricting the power to voluntary enlistments. But it is reasonably certain from a thorough reading that they were urging only two points: that the power should apply in peace as well as war; that there should be no specific limitation of numbers to be enlisted.⁸³

Hamilton's suggestion that the power embraced "the customary and ordinary modes practised, in other governments" is worth considering. The question arises: practiced when? At the time the words were included in the Constitution or when the exercise of the power is later challenged? In 1787 or in 1944? By 1917 nearly all countries employed wartime conscription;⁸⁴ by 1939 about one-half the countries had peacetime conscription, though none of the Anglo-American democracies employed it.⁸⁵ I think it would be generally agreed that we are trying to discover the practice in 1787 so as to discover the meaning attached by the framers of the Constitution. The authority on conscription, Captain Elbridge Colby, points out that conscription did not exist in 1787:

"We must look upon conscription * * * as something characteristically modern * * * occurred for the first time in France * * * September 5, 1798."⁸⁶

He distinguishes conscription from the old feudal levies, the French "milice" and the British and American militia. In 1704

83. The Federalist XXIII, XXVI, XLI. Pinckney's speech, which appeared in pamphlet form, was never fully delivered and cannot be considered to reflect the views of delegates; 3 Farrand, *op. cit. supra* note 29, 106, 116, 118-9. Mr. Martin's report to the Maryland legislature is often referred to as proving unlimited federal power: "Congress have also the power given them to raise and support *armies*, without *any limitation* as to numbers, and without any restriction in time of peace." (*Ibid.* 207.) This is part of an impassioned speech to get Maryland to reject the Constitution.

84. See list in Selective Draft Law Cases at p. 378, *op. cit., supra*, note 43.

85. Great Britain, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, United States; see *League of Nations, Armament Year Book*, 1938 and 1939-40.

86. "Conscription in Modern Form," *The Infantry Journal*, June 1929. See also his articles in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* and the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

and 1707 attempts to compel military service were rejected by the British Parliament as unconstitutional. In 1756, 1757, 1778, 1779 criminals, "idle and disorderly persons" were 'pressed into British service as punishment.⁸⁷ Even these acts were severely criticised in England and were objected to in our Declaration of Independence.⁸⁸ "When voluntary enlistments fell short of the proposed numbers (during the American Revolution), the deficiencies were, by the laws of the several states, to be made up by draft or lots from the militia."⁸⁹ It would therefore appear that the plan adopted by the constitutional convention was not standing armies, not conscript or impressed armies but the distinctly Anglo-American militia system (in the United States, State-militia system).

The only Supreme Court case to consider fully the militia and its relation to the army, *United States v. Miller*,⁹⁰ states:

"The Militia which the States were expected to maintain and train is set in contrast with Troops which they were forbidden to keep without the consent of Congress. The sentiment of the time strongly disfavored standing armies; the common view was that adequate defense of country and laws could be secured through the Militia—civilians primarily, soldiers on occasion.

"The signification attributed to the term Militia appears from the debates in the Convention, the history and legislation of Colonies and States, and the writings of approved commentators. These show plainly enough that the Militia comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense. 'A body of citizens enrolled for military discipline.' And further, that ordinarily when called for service these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time."

Federal legislation has always drawn a distinction between

87. 4 Anne. Ch. 10; 29 Geo. 2, Ch. 4; 30 Geo. 2, Ch. 8; 18 Geo. 3, Ch. 53; 19 Geo. 3, ch. 10.

88. Declaration of Independence; 1 LECKY, HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE 18TH CENTURY (1891) 500 ff.

89. 2 RAMSEY'S LIFE OF WASHINGTON (1807) 246; other authorities are found in *United States v. Miller*, 307 U. S. 174, 59 Sup. Ct. 816 (1938) and the briefs filed therein.

90. 307 U. S. 174, 179, 59 Sup. Ct. 816, 818 (1938).

“armies” (volunteers under the power to raise armies) and “national forces” or militia (all able bodied citizens)—see footnote 102.

History of State Militia—Federal Organizing, Arming, Disciplining.

The relationship of the states and the federal government to the militia was well understood. Both began acting in accordance with the theory of supremacy of the state and restriction of the federal supervision to the above stated matters. On April 4, 1786, New York enacted a law “That every able-bodied Male Person, being a Citizen of this State * * * (except such Persons as are hereinafter excepted)” should be a part of her militia, should furnish certain arms, etc. Massachusetts provided for the composition of her militia at the January Session in 1784. Virginia ^{90a} did likewise in October 1785. These militia or compulsory military service laws granted exemptions to those who could not participate in war because of religious beliefs.⁹¹ The power of the States thus to compel military service, subject to these exemptions has been upheld.⁹²

In December 1790 Congress considered the first Militia bill. One of the questions was who had the real control of the militia and who could grant exemptions—all agreed that the states had major control because the militia belonged to the state.⁹³ When the Militia act was passed in 1792 it therefore provided for “exemptions as the legislatures of the several states shall provide.”⁹⁴ Other similar statutes followed. All of these recognized the militia as a state organization, composed of the male citizens “of the respective States” with the exception of those persons “who are exempted by the laws of the respective States.”⁹⁵

90a. 12 Hening's Statutes.

91. 245 U. S. 366, 375, 38 Sup. Ct. 159, 165 (1917).

92. *State v. Wheeler*, 141 N. Car. 773, 53 S. E. 358 (1906); *Peo. ex rel. German Ins. Co. v. Williams*, 145 Ill. 573, 33 N. E. 849 (1893); *Lanahan v. Birge*, 30 Conn. 438 (1862); *In re Dassler*, 35 Kan. 678, 12 Pac. 130 (1886).

93. 4 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 422-4, 438.

94. 1 STAT. 271 (1792).

95. Act of Apr. 30, 1810, c. 37; Act of Apr. 18, 1814, c. 80; Act of Apr. 20, 1816, c. 64; Act of May 12, 1820, c. 97; Act of Mar. 19, 1836, c. 44; Act

When Secretary of War Knox, on January 18 and 21, 1790, proposed a federal militia on the theory that all men owed a "military duty for the defense of the state"⁹⁶ his plan was not only rejected in Congress, but Rhode Island, which had not yet ratified the constitution, recommended an amendment: "that no person shall be compelled to do military duty, otherwise than by voluntary enlistment, except in case of general invasion * * *"⁹⁷ The first proposal of a conscription law in 1815 not only called forth Daniel Webster's attack resulting in the defeat of the bill, to which reference has been made, but it also brought representatives from various states together in the Hartford Convention where it was declared:

"The power of compelling the militia and other citizens of the United States, by a forcible draft or conscription, to serve in the regular armies, as proposed in a late official letter of the secretary of war, is not delegated to Congress by the constitution, and the exercise of it would be not less dangerous to their liberties than hostile to the sovereignty of the states. The effort to deduce this power from the right of raising armies is a flagrant attempt to pervert the sense of the clause in the constitution, which confers that right, and is incompatible with other provisions in that instrument. The armies of the United States have always been raised by contract, never by conscription, and nothing more can be wanting to a government possessing the power thus claimed, to enable it to usurp the entire control of the militia, in derogation of the authority of the state, and to convert it by impressment into a standing army."⁹⁸

Gradually the states abandoned the enrollment of militiamen and did not enforce their compulsory service laws. New York in 1846 exempted everyone from service on payment of a fee. The states had come to believe that the organized militia (national guard), supported solely by voluntary enlistment, was sufficient. This "breakdown" of the militia system and the inability to induct the organized militia into the federal forces are

of July 29, 1861, c. 25; Act of Mar. 2, 1867, c. 145; Rev. Stat. of 1878, Ch. XVI; Act of Jan. 21, 1903, c. 196, 32 Stat. L. 775.

96. 7 NILES'S REG. 296.

97. 1 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 372.

98. 7 NILES'S REG. 307.

given by Adjutant General Louis Stotesbury as the reasons for the federal selective service legislation.⁹⁹ But this abandonment of enrollment and use of volunteering by the states could not extend federal powers. In fact this very situation was foreseen in the Constitutional Convention and one of the proposals rejected read: "when states neglect to provide regulations for militia, it should be regulated and established by the legislature of the United States."¹⁰⁰ It may be that the United States, under its power of organizing, arming and disciplining could provide that regular registrations be made, and that a certain amount of drill in a certain manual of arms be given.

History—Calling Forth the State Militia.

From the beginning, a second type of law was also enacted by Congress, not under its power to organize the militia, but under its power to call out the militia, for the purpose of enforcing law, suppressing insurrection, repelling invasion. The act of February 28, 1795, provided: "That whenever the United States shall be invaded, or be in imminent danger of invasion from any foreign nation or Indian tribe, it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to call forth such number of the *militia of the state, or states* * * * as he may judge necessary to repel such invasion."¹⁰¹ This was the form of authorization used even during the War Between the States until the act of March 3, 1863, c. 75 which was hermaphroditic: expressed to be in fulfillment of "the duty of the government to suppress insurrection and rebellion", thus fitting into the power to call forth the militia, but containing a new provision that all citizens between twenty and forty-five "are hereby declared to constitute the national forces and shall be liable to perform military duty in the service of the United States when called by the President."¹⁰² A similar provision was enacted in 1898 and

99. N. Y. Times, p. 14, July 15, 1940.

100. 5 ELLIOT'S DEBATES (1876) 443, 465.

101. Act of Feb. 28, 1795, c. 36, 1 STAT. 424. See also: Act of May 9, 1794, c. 27; Act of June 24, 1797, c. 4; Act of Mar. 3, 1803, c. 32; Act of Apr. 18, 1806, c. 32; Act of Mar. 30, 1808, c. 39; Act of Apr. 10, 1812, c. 55; Act of July 17, 1862, c. 201.

102. Under this statute men were conscripted during the latter part of the

remains in force today.¹⁰³ These provisions would seem to attempt to create a federal "militia" in direct opposition to the decision reached in 1787 that there was to be no such militia.¹⁰⁴ No authoritative case has passed upon their constitutionality since the only question which has come before the courts is the power to compel military service in wartime. In 1863 the provisions drafting men for military service were a part of this type of statute, in 1917 and 1940 they were completely separate.¹⁰⁵

History—Raising and Regulating the Army.

As we have seen, there are three interrelated federal powers: (1) providing for organizing, arming and disciplining the state militia, (2) calling out the militia and (3) raising and regulating the Army and Navy. We have discussed elsewhere the restrictions on the power to raise armies. It is now only important to examine the expanding concept of "armies", as appears from federal laws, and to determine the extent to which the federal government has maintained the distinction between "armies" and "national forces" or "militia."¹⁰⁶ It can be seen from the statutes

civil war and this power was upheld (footnote 42). The draft riots and general opposition to the Act are well known. Its inefficiency is attested by the fact that 2,435,028 union troops were volunteers, only 255,373 were conscripted and of these only 50,663 personally served.

103. Act of Apr. 22, 1898, c. 187, 30 STAT. 361; 10 U. S. C. A. § 1 (1927); 32 U. S. C. A. § 1 (1928); see footnote 106.

104. See *supra* notes 69-75. Note that if all these provisions operate every adult male is (1) a part of the state militia (Act of Jan. 21, 1903, c. 196, 32 STAT. L. 775) and (2) of the federal militia (32 U. S. C. A. 1) and (3) of the national forces (Act of Apr. 22, 1898, c. 187, 30 STAT. 361 and 10 U. S. C. A. 1). Note also that a distinction is drawn between "armies" and "national forces" (militia)—10 U. S. C. A. secs. 1 and 2; 32 U. S. C. A. sec. 1.

There is some evidence of a *deliberate* attempt to eliminate state control of the militia. See EDMUNDS, *THE MILITARIZATION OF THE UNITED STATES*, 10-12.

105. Act of May 18, 1917, c. 15, 40 STAT. 76; Act of Sept. 16, 1940, c. 720, 54 STAT. 885.

106. Act of Sept. 29, 1789, c. 25: the military establishment created the year before "is hereby recognized to be the establishment for the troops in the service of the United States."

Act of May 28, 1798, c. 47: authorized the President "in the event of a declaration of war against the United States, or of actual invasion of their territory, by a foreign power, or of imminent danger of such invasion * * *

set forth in the footnote, constituting as they do a quick outline of the federal law, that the term "army" did not originally, and has not even now come to include the process by which the general manpower of the country are subjected to military duty. But the provisions prescribing general military service duty do attempt to create a federal militia in contravention of the intentment of the Constitution.

APPENDIX III

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 5, 1959.*

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Forces Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Enclosed herewith is a copy of my statement for insertion in the record of your hearing on the extension of the selective service law.

I regret that the time element has prevented a personal presentation of my views and opinions, for I should have preferred to speak with you and not to you on this complex problem of manpower mobilization.

I hope you have an opportunity to read the contents of the statement before final action is taken for approval by your committee, of the bill.

Cordially yours,

MURRAY S. LEVINE.

STATEMENT BY MURRAY S. LEVINE, ATTORNEY, NEW YORK, N.Y., TO THE ARMED SERVICE COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE ON EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE, MARCH 5, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this statement for the record in conjunction with the hearings on the extension of the Selective Service Act.

I will cover what I consider the two important issues involved: (a) Shall the selective service law be extended? and (b) Will the extended legislation provide sufficient authority to achieve the full mobilization which may be required in a total war emergency?

The answer in the first issue becomes academic because of the perilous international situation. I believe it is absolutely essential to continue a system of procedures which furnish the human resources which will be required for our common defense. The Selective Service Act which has created this system, must therefore, be extended without delay, to insure its continuity.

The answer to the second issue requires a great deal of soul searching and objective deliberation because implicit therein will be found problems affecting the further curtailment of individual personal freedom and action in peacetime, for a war which may come in the future.

Much has been said about mobilization in the past few weeks. In early February, Gen. Maxwell Taylor urged total mobilization in view of the Berlin crisis, stating that like in a game of poker, we must be ready to play all of our chips. Yesterday, however, President Eisenhower at his press conference, declared that general mobilization would be "futile and disastrous."

I believe that whether or not we should mobilize at this time, is not as important as whether or not we are now fully prepared to effectuate an adequate mobilization.

Gen. Lewis Hershey, with his usual candor and commonsense, has recently raised this point by inference, in his testimony on this very bill before the Armed Services House Committee. His following words should be carefully noted:

"We are not doing all we should in preparation against possible nuclear attack. Our training for civil defense lags. Our reserves must be made ready. Our need to do things in preparation is great. Many of them are not being done. Much needs to be done but many are not doing it."

I believe that "much needs to be done" by your committee on the problem of selective service. I strongly urge that you reconsider and reexamine the provisions of the selective service law before it is extended. I question its adequacy. I believe it is faulty because of errors of omission.

I believe that our present system of procedures for selective service has not kept abreast with the increased and unique requirements for manpower mobili-

zation. These new requirements have originated, like other new requirements in defense measures, from the cumulative effects of the dynamic progress in the physical sciences which have placed in the hands of our enemies massive weapons of attack of great force and power. It seems to me only basic that our human resources and material resources should always be kept in balance for defense purposes. If not, our entire defense structure will remain lopsided.

Recruiting of people either by voluntary means or conscription, has always been a sensitive problem for in doing so we deal with human emotions. Homes and families are invaded, but, fortunately there are set patterns which can serve as a valuable guide. These can be found in the truths of history which I rely on to a great extent in my opinions hereinafter expressed.

Before further discussion, I think it would be well that I first give you a brief résumé of my background.

Prior to and immediately following World War II, I served as an official speaker for New York City selective service headquarters and a member of a local draft board; in early 1943, military attaché to New York City selective service headquarters; July 1943 through August 6, 1945, as an Army officer, as Chief of the Selective Service Division for the entire Manhattan project (handled all the selective service problems for the three major installations and approximately 400 contractors and subcontractors engaged in work on the atomic bomb): Assistant to the Chief of the Radiological Safety Section at Bikini June 1946 through August 1946; 1948 to date local draft board member; also have made self-study of civil defense and selective service matters a prime avocation (my statements to various congressional committees mentioned below ¹).

We have a bad national habit in judging preparedness by the amount of money spent for defense measures. For example, I have often heard said that \$2 billion built the atomic bomb (or Einstein built the atomic bomb, or it was the brilliant leadership of Gen. Leslie R. Groves and his able assistants). The truth is that the bomb was not built by money, or an individual, or group of individuals, but by a team of people, i.e., the common laborers who cleared the sites of the projects; the ordinary skilled mechanics who built the home, the schools, the stores and the plants for those to follow; the architects and engineers who supervised the construction of our installations from the blueprint stage to completion; the tens of thousands of people who were taught to manipulate and control strange gadgets or operation and production; the brilliant scientists who gave of their brains; and the personnel of the Army who supervised the entire project. The atomic bomb was built by the brains and brawn of a large cross section of our people, and not by money, and in the last analysis, it will be the brains and brawn of all our people which will win the next war.

Recruitment for the Manhattan project was a difficult task because of secrecy. We were faced with many problems, many of which were solved by the selective service law which was used to great advantage in our work. It helped us select and retain 52,000 men who were critically needed in our work. It also was used to curb strikes, combat absenteeism and tardiness and to prevent shifting of trained personnel. The selective service law became a powerful ally to help build the atomic bomb. It should now remain a powerful ally to help defend ourselves against the atomic bomb. To a large extent this will be up to you in your present deliberations of the proposed extension of the selective service law.

I have studied with keen interest the military history of the British covering the period during and immediately following the air raids of Coventry, Birmingham, and London. The British called these attacks "major battles of the war" and much can be learned for our common good by a competent appraisal of both Government and citizenry response in their critical hour of peril.

Line officers of high rank spoke openly and freely to the people. One made this statement at Cambridge University in 1941:

"This war is a war of nerves. It will be won by the side that destroys the morale, the will to resist, of the other side. It is a war which turns every citizen, man or woman, old or young, into a military objective. No longer can the civilian say, 'you fight and we will help.' In this war the civilian is in it just as much as the soldier. He must expect to have to hit back, to help actively in battle."

¹ See my testimony before (1) Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Mar. 20, 1950; (2) House of Representatives Committee on Armed Forces, Special Committee on Civil Defense, Dec. 7, 1950; (3) Subcommittee on the Committee of Government Operations, House of Representatives, June 12, 1956; (4) the same subcommittee on Mar. 6, 1957.

Another one stated:

"Everyone is in this battle against air attack, except those who are debarred by age or infirmity. Only thus can we win this battle and save our cities from destruction."

British Maj. Gen. G. M. Lindsey, an expert in tank warfare, brought this message to the British people in 1942:

"The meaning of totalitarianism war is not simple war as conducted by totalitarian powers, but war in which the whole effort of the country, its human as well as its material resources, its civilian as well as its armed services, are fully engaged. It is thus war on two fronts, military and civil. *I liken the war effort to a triangle, the apex of which is the fighting forces, the base of which represents ordinary population of the country. If the base of the triangle should disintegrate the apex will fall to the ground.*" [Emphasis mine.]

The battle of Britain symbolizes the complexities of future wars. It also signifies that only the total effort, on the part of a total people, can bring total victory. It is a part of history which every democracy should read and know. It has given us established precedents of which we can build our preparation for common defense.

It is, therefore wise that we pause a moment in our exploration of the moon and return to the earth—to reevaluate the base of our "triangle." Like the British General Lindsey, I consider the base of our "triangle" a well organized population, fully aware of their new responsibilities for the common defense and totally committed to do their bit should the emergency arise. Actually these responsibilities may be new to our contemporaries, but they have long been stated in the history of warfare. America followed this principal in the unwritten law of conscription adopted by the minute men in the early days of the American dream. It was better defined in a letter by George Washington to Alexander Hamilton after the Revolutionary War, in these terms:

"It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a portion of his property, but even of his personal services to the defense of it."

The French, in 1793, adopted the same principal as a democracy in their famous "levée en masse":

"Young men shall fight; the married men shall forge weapons and transport supplies; the women will make tents and clothes and will serve in hospitals; the children will make up old linen into lint; the old men will have themselves carried into the public square to rouse the courage of the fighting men."

History also reveals the stark truth—that America has made serious blunders in recruiting for the common defense in all our wars with the possible exception of World War II, where through the process of trial and error, the Selective Service Act of 1940 provided an almost perfect system for recruiting and yet I am reminded that the Selective Service Act was passed by only one vote by the Congress.

We have paid for our past mistakes with blood and money, as the history of the War of 1812 and the Civil War will reveal, but this time the price may be much higher. Mobilization must be complete and total for no compromise can be made against the requirements of total war.

We have made a feeble attack to mobilize our civilian populations under a voluntary system established by the civil defense law. Feebleness and indecisiveness in the sensitive matter of recruitment begets failure, and we have failed miserably. Manpower is the backbone of our defense preparation. It should not be treated as a step child. It cannot be handled in a hokus-pokus manner. We even may find it necessary to induce citizen participation to meet their responsibilities. If we do, we must prepare a system for total recruiting in advance.

Inertia on the part of our people and their representatives breeds additional evils. One which has been of great concern to me, can be found in the civil defense law and particularly in the philosophy of the said law. This philosophy expounds the theory that each individual must hide and save his neck and run away in a catastrophe. Is it a direct antithesis of the philosophy of the selective service law, for it is anarchic in nature. (Read testimony 3 and 4 mentioned in footnote 1.)

I hope I am wrong in this conclusion, but if I am correct, in my opinion, you should know about it and do something about it.

Again I am reminded of the words of General Taylor: "You cannot play around in this business unless you have a lot of blue chips in your pocket. This

is unlimited poker." I agree fully with this statement considering the shrewdness of our enemy. They may be bluffing in this poker game of Berlin, but on the other hand, their cards may be stacked. But, it only seems prudent that inasmuch as we have called their bluff, that we have all of the blue chips in our pocket to call at the last turn of the cards. Do we have the blue chips ready? I think we don't. I think they are scattered all over the country in the minds and hearts of a confused people.

We must pocket these chips quickly. For that purpose I make the following specific recommendations in regard to the selective service law. In my opinion, it will fill a "straight flush" in the game of defense preparedness.

1. That the Selective Service Act be amplified to include provisions to induce, if necessary, participation by all citizens except those debarred for physical, morale, or age limitations, in common defense requirements.

2. That a prohibition be made to prevent the draft of civilians other than those required for the Armed Forces, unless and until the President of the United States declares a national emergency.

3. That the Director of Selective Service be authorized to immediately set in motion the legal machinery for citizen registration including their physical conditions and occupational aptitudes.

4. That the Selective Service System be considered a recruiting agency for all the Armed Forces and civil defense.

5. That the operational requirements of selective service be vested exclusively in volunteer personnel at the community level as it is today in local boards.

Gentlemen, the danger of war is live and real. When one inch of territory in Berlin can trigger a military explosion over vast areas in the continental United States, prudence dictates that we must prepare for the worst and then hope and pray for the best. I firmly believe that we can win another world war. I don't buy the defeatist attitude that there is nothing we can do about it if war is thrust upon us. I firmly believe that if you start the ball rolling in selective service—the rest will be accomplished by our people.

×

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86-4

H. R. 2260

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 2260.....	1
Digest of Public Law 86-4.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 2260

Jan.	12,	1959	Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 2260 which was referred to House Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill.
Feb.	2,	1959	House committee reported S. 2260 with amendment. House Report 27. Print of bill and H.Rept.
Feb.	3,	1959	Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 2260. H.Res. 153 and H.Rept. 29. Print of resolution and report.
Feb.	4,	1959	House began debate on H. R. 2260.
Feb.	5,	1959	House passed H. R. 2260 as reported.
Feb.	6,	1959	H. R. 2260 was referred to Senate Committee on Armed Services.
Mar.	9,	1959	Senate committee reported H. R. 2260 with amendments. Senate. Report 96. Print of bill and Senate report.
Mar.	10,	1959	Senate began debate on H. R. 2260.
Mar.	11,	1959	Senate passed H. R. 2260 as reported.
Mar.	12,	1959	House concurred in Senate amendments.
Mar.	23,	1959	Approved: Public Law 86-4.

Hearings: Senate hearing on H. R. 2260.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-4

EXTENSION OF MILITARY DRAFT. Extends the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act for 4 years, until July 1, 1963. Extends for the same period authority to continue payments of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty with the armed services.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 12, 1959

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and
4 Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467 (c)), is
5 amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and in-
6 serting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter
8 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208) , is amended by striking out
9 the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1,
10 1963" in place thereof.

1 SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of
2 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by
3 striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the
4 words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

5 SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public
6 Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is repealed.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

A BILL

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

By Mr. VINSON

JANUARY 12, 1959

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued February 3, 1959
For actions of February 2, 1959
86th-1st, No. 17

Acreage allotments.....	55	
Animal diseases.....	41	
Atomic energy.....	6	
Budget.....	15, 21, 32	
Centennial celebration.....	1	
Committee assignments.....	46	
Conservation.....	13	
Cooperatives.....	1, 53	
Cotton.....	55	
Dairy products.....	49	
Depressed areas.....	50	
Education.....	26, 54	
Electrification.....	45	
Employment.....	13, 31, 47	
Farm program.....	10, 25	
Flood control.....	30, 38	
Food.....	57	
Food distribution.....	28	
Foreign trade.....	16	
Forestry.....	29	
Grain storage.....	36	
GSA.....	4	
Health.....	44	
Holiday.....	48	
Housing.....	20, 22	
Item veto.....	51	
Lands.....	34	
Legislative program.....	9, 22	
Livestock.....	35	
Loans.....	42	
Marketing.....	35	
Military training.....	3	
Milk.....	24, 40, 49	
Monopolies.....	7	
Patents.....	11	
Personnel.....	12, 43	
Public power.....	14	
Records.....	4	
Reports.....	4	
Research.....	5, 44, 56	
Sheep workers.....	27	
Small business.....	46	
Special milk.....	24	
Statehood.....	19	
Surplus commodities.....	8, 28, 37	
Taxation.....	15, 53	
Textiles.....	23	
TV stations.....	17	
Water.....	29	
Water pollution.....	33	
Water rights.....	34	
Weather.....	5	
Wood control.....	39	
Wetlands.....	52	
Wildlife.....	52	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received USDA proposed bill for centennial celebration of USDA and land-grant colleges. Both Houses received from Treasury proposed bill for taxation of dividends of cooperatives. Sen. Mansfield introduced and discussed meat promotion program bill. Sen. Proxmire introduced and discussed bill to provide long-term contracts for disposal of surplus commodities. Sens. Humphrey and Proxmire introduced and discussed bill to establish milk program for needy families. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to provide protection against livestock and poultry diseases. Sen. Ellender introduced bill to establish FHA revolving fund. Several Reps. introduced and discussed bills to establish uniform milk sanitation standards and regulations.

HOUSE

- 1. CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.** Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land, grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture; to Judiciary Committees. pp. 1349, 1488
- 2. COOPERATIVES.** Both Houses received from the Treasury Department a proposed bill "to assure that income allocated as patronage dividends by cooperatives is taxed either to the cooperative or the patron"; to H. Ways and Means and S. Finance Committees. pp. 1348, 1489
- 3. MILITARY TRAINING.** The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2260, to extend the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (H. Rept. 27). p. 1489

4. REPORTS. Both Houses received from the General Services Administration its annual report, and a report of the Archivist of the U. S. on records proposed for disposal. pp. 1348, 1349, 1488
5. WEATHER RESEARCH. Both Houses received from the Commerce Department a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. pp. 1348, 1488
6. ATOMIC ENERGY. Both Houses received the annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission. pp. 1349, 1488
Rep. Flood discussed the benefits of peaceful uses of atomic energy, including atomic reactors. pp. 1479-84
7. MONOPOLIES. Rep. Roosevelt urged greater authority for the Federal Trade Commission for the prevention of monopolistic practices. p. 1484
8. SURPLUS FOODS. Rep. Oliver spoke in favor of his proposed bill to provide for the distribution of surplus foods to needy persons. pp. 1456-7
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced the following bills will probably be debated this week: H. R. 2256, providing direct loans for veterans, and H. R. 2260, to extend the Selective Service Act. p. 1468

SENATE

10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Young (N. D.) asked and received consent to correct a table he had put in the Record, Jan. 29, concerning USDA expenditures. p. 1340
11. PATENTS. Both Houses received from the Department of Commerce a proposed bill to amend title 28 of the U. S. Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the U. S.; to the Judiciary Committee. pp. 1349, 1488
12. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill to limit to cases involving national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 1349
13. EMPLOYMENT. Received from Rhode Island General Assembly a resolution requesting Congress "to implement more effectively the Federal responsibility to promote and maintain full employment." p. 1350
14. PUBLIC POWER. Received from the General Assembly of Rhode Island a resolution requesting Congress "to provide for a study of public power potentials in the waters of New York and New England." p. 1350
15. BUDGET AND TAXATION. Sen. Carlson inserted two resolutions of the American National Cattlemen's Association urging economy in government and an "equitable" system of taxation. p. 1351.
Sen. Allott inserted an editorial, "Coyote for Watchdog," discussing who is responsible for government spending and savings. pp. 1380-1
16. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Javits inserted a resolution of the Catholic War Veterans of Kings County opposing trade with Communist countries. p. 1351
17. TV BOOSTER STATIONS. Sen. Allott asked and received consent to add Sen. Langer's name to the sponsors of S. J. Res. 26, to rescind the recent FCC ruling abolishing VHF TV booster stations, and Sen. Langer inserted his letter to FCC on this matter. pp. 1376-77

EXTENDING UNTIL JULY 1, 1963, THE INDUCTION PROVISIONS OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT; THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 3, 1950, SUSPENDING PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES; AND THE DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 2260]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistant Act of 1950, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 6, strike out the word "repealed", and substitute the following in lieu thereof:

amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

The proposed legislation, as amended, has four objectives:

1. It extends the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

2. It extends the so-called doctors' draft law from its present expiration date of July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

3. It extends the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

4. It extends the Dependents Assistance Act, the law under which enlisted personnel of the Armed Forces receive increased allowances, from its present termination date of July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

BACKGROUND

In 1940 the Congress enacted the Selective Service Act. This law expired in March of 1947. In June of 1948, the Congress reenacted the Selective Service Act and the Nation has had a draft act ever since. In other words, the Nation has had a draft law continuously since 1940, except for a 17-month period between March of 1947 and June of 1948.

The 1948 draft act, which was then known as the Selective Service Act of 1948, and has since been renamed the Universal Military Training and Service Act, was enacted by the Congress at the request of President Truman who delivered a message to the Congress on March 17, 1958, calling for the prompt increase in the standing military forces of the United States.

Back in March of 1948, before the reenactment of the 1948 Selective Service Act, and after extensive recruiting efforts on the part of the armed services, our Military Establishment reached a total of 1,384,500 men. It is of interest to note that on March 1, 1948, the Army was 129,000 men below its authorized strength of 669,000, and was facing a greater decline because of the failure to obtain increased volunteer enlistments.

In President Truman's message of March 1948, he said:

Our Armed Forces lack the necessary men to maintain their authorized strength. They have been unable to maintain their authorized strength through voluntary enlistments even though such strength has been reduced to the very minimum necessary to meet our obligations abroad and is far below the minimum which should always be available in the continental United States.

In 1948, the Congress faced the problem of increasing the strength of our Armed Forces from 1,384,000 to 2 million men. And it required a draft law to accomplish this objective. Today the Congress faces the problem of maintaining a force in excess of 2½ million men. It appears obvious that if the Nation had difficulty in maintaining a force of 1,384,000 in 1948 and found it impossible to go to 2 million men on a voluntary basis, the problem would be compounded today if the Nation attempted to maintain a force of 2½ million men on a voluntary basis.

The Congress reenacted the draft act in 1948 and the Nation has had the draft ever since.

There is probably no law on the statute books that is closer to the American people than the draft law. American boys are affected by this law and almost every family has a son or relative who has been exposed, in one form or another, to military service.

The Armed Services Committee, and the Congress, would like to see the day arrive when the draft is no longer necessary. But it is manifestly clear to the Committee on Armed Services that the draft is indispensable to our security.

Congress has passed many laws to improve the careers of service personnel and to stimulate reenlistments. Those laws have been successful and our reenlistment rates have increased. But those laws basically are aimed at retaining trained, experienced men in our Armed Forces. The Nation still must fill the gap between the trained specialists and the men who do the everyday jobs so vital to the maintenance of our national security. These are the seamen in our Navy:

the infantrymen in our Army divisions; the marines of our ready forces in the Marine Corps; and the airmen who keep our planes in the skies.

IS THE DRAFT FAIR?

There are some who think that the chances of being drafted are so slim that the draft law should be revised, and that the age of liability should be reduced from 26 to 24.

Statistics presented to the Committee on Armed Services reveal that on November 30, 1958, of the total number of registrants attaining the age of 26, 9 out of 10 of the qualified registrants were serving on active duty or had completed their military obligation, 7 out of 10 of all registrants, including those not qualified, had either completed their military obligation or were in the process of completing their military obligation.

The statistics also indicate that by July 1, 1963, 55 percent of all registrants at age 26 will have fulfilled their military obligation or will be in the process of fulfilling their obligation; 8 out of 10 qualified registrants at age 26 will have fulfilled their military obligation or will be in the process of fulfilling their military obligation.

SEVENTY PERCENT HAVE SERVED

There were in June 1958, between 1,100,000 and 1,200,000 men in the U.S. population in each of the age classes between age 19 and 26 years, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Detailed cumulative records of the number of young men who have entered military service from each of these age classes have been compiled by the Department of Defense and submitted to the Committee on Armed Services. These statistics show that of the 1,100,000 men aged 26 on June 30, 1958 (between age 25½ years and 26½ years), 770,000, or 70 percent, had entered military service and had fulfilled, or were fulfilling, their military service obligation under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Of this total, 467,000 had volunteered into the Armed Forces, either as enlistees or under the various officer appointment programs. A total of 286,000 had been inducted, and about 17,000 had entered the Reserves and National Guard, and had or were fulfilling Reserve training obligations, including 3 to 6 months of active duty for training.

Of the remaining 330,000 men in this age class, 240,000, or 22 percent, had been found unfit for military service under standards in effect at the time when these young men were screened. In addition, 90,000 were in deferred or exempt classes, including dependency students, occupational deferments, ministers, etc. The net number of qualified men immediately available in the military manpower pool, in this age, was estimated at less than 5,000—including both fathers and nonfathers. Moreover, of this total, only 647, by direct count, were in the category of class I-A, nonfathers, between age 25½ years and their 26th birthday.

It is evident from these statistics that among young men currently reaching the normal terminal age of military service liability under the existing law a high proportion of all young men—7 out of 10—and an even higher proportion of those qualified for service—9 out of 10—have fulfilled, or are fulfilling, their military service obligation and the remainder are almost entirely in deferred categories.

SOME 55 PERCENT WILL SERVE

The Department of Defense also submitted detailed projections of the military service status of each of the age classes between age 19 and 26 years, for June 30, 1963. These projections are based on estimated requirements of each of the military services from the manpower pool, under the assumption of continuation of currently authorized military strengths. The estimates indicate that, of a total of 1,150,000 men who will be age 26 in 1963, 628,000 or 55 percent, will have entered military service by that date. Included in this total are 415,000 volunteers into the Active Forces, 112,000 inductees, and 101,000 in the Reserves and National Guard.

Of the 520,000 who will not have entered service, about 340,000 will have been classified as unfit for service under existing physical, mental, and moral standards of qualification. The remaining 180,000 will consist, almost entirely, of fathers in classes III-A or I-A or of registrants in various other deferred categories. The number of nonfathers remaining in the available manpower pool at this age is estimated at less than 5,000.

From these estimates, which have been carefully reviewed by other interested Federal agencies, it is apparent that 5½ out of 10 men reaching age 26 in 1963 will have entered military service, and that nearly 8 out of 10 qualified men will have entered service, in this age class. It is also indicated that virtually no nonfathers, qualified for service and available under Selective Service regulations, is likely to pass through his period of military service liability without voluntarily or involuntarily entering military service.

It appears, therefore, that the chances of being drafted, or of fulfilling a military obligation in our Armed Forces, are substantially greater than some would have us believe.

The logical question follows: "How is this possible in view of the substantial manpower pool and in view of the fact that we drafted only 138,000 men in 1958, and are expected to draft about 100,000 in 1959?"

On the average, over 500,000 men a year enter the Armed Forces either as inductees, as 6-month trainees, or as voluntary recruits in one of the Armed Forces.

In addition, draft boards are not drafting fathers and this, of course, increases the deferment rate to a considerable extent. Fathers are either classified as I-A and available but place in a low priority so that they are not reached, or they are classified as III-A and deferred for hardship reasons.

The Committee on Armed Services feels that fathers should not be inducted if this can be avoided. So long as there are a sufficient number of nonfathers available in the manpower pool, the committee is of the opinion that these individuals should be inducted before inducting fathers.

Whenever a father is inducted into the Armed Forces the impact upon his local community is greater than if a nonfather is inducted. The induction of fathers is bound to increase hardships throughout the country. And from a practical viewpoint, and because of the Dependents Assistance Act, it is obviously less expensive to the Government to induct nonfathers than to induct fathers.

Today local boards liberally defer college students. The committee recognizes the fact that this is essential in the face of increasing demands for persons trained in the various sciences.

While there are not a great number of people in college who are over the age of 24, nevertheless there are some who would be affected by a reduced draft age because local boards certainly are not going to permit college students to escape their military responsibility merely by attending college. As deferred registrants, these individuals would be liable for induction up to age 35, but local boards might be inclined to deny student deferments beyond the age of 24 if their liability terminated at that age.

At present, virtually no one who is draft liable and over the age of 26 is being drafted, since they are placed in the lowest priority.

If the draft age should be reduced to age 24, it is possible, depending upon force levels, that the President would have to rearrange the priorities of induction so that many fathers, before attaining the age of 24, would be inducted.

But the most significant point to remember with respect to the present draft liability age spread is the fact that 50 percent of present inductees volunteer for induction and, for practical purposes, select the period of time when they wish to fulfill their military obligation.

Young men can volunteer for induction at the age of 17 with their parents' consent, and at the age of 18 without parental consent.

Thus there is ample opportunity for young men to fulfill their military obligation before attaining the age of 26. By retaining the age of 26 the law gives the young men of the Nation an opportunity to volunteer for service before completing their education, or, in the alternative, lets them complete their education and then fulfill their military obligation. If the draft age is reduced, then the opportunity for fulfilling a military obligation after receiving higher education may be jeopardized, which would in turn be reflected in fewer educational deferments.

It should also be noted that should the President decide that he does not need to draft people over the age of 24, but instead wants to use a particular age group, he has ample authority to induct by age group. There is a specific provision in existing law, which will be extended under the proposed legislation, that gives the President the right to provide for the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups. Thus, the President, if he so desires, can order the induction of individuals in certain age groups so long as these groups are within the age of liability. Thus, there is considerable flexibility in the law as it now stands. This flexibility must be preserved. Any reduction in the age of liability would reduce the manpower pool, relieve thousands of young men of a military obligation, necessitate a rearrangement of priorities, seriously affect present deferment policies, lower the number of essential educational deferments, and seriously jeopardize the operation of the Selective Service System in the event of a sudden emergency necessitating increased service strengths.

It should be noted that last year the Congress gave the President the authority to raise the physical and mental standards for induction. This has increased the IV-F deferment rate from 22 percent to 33 percent; but it has also vastly improved the efficiency of the Army. In addition, since then the Army prison population has dropped so sharply that an Army disciplinary barracks has been closed.

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

There are 4,012 local boards throughout the United States in the area covered by the Selective Service System. In addition, there are 93 appeal boards, and 26 extra panels in those areas where the appeal load requires additional boards. The law requires that there be an appeal board in each Federal judicial district. There is also a State headquarters for each State and Territory.

A local board consists of three persons and an appeal board consists of five members, as do each of the panels.

The head of the Selective Service System in each State is recommended by the Governor and appointed by the President. Likewise, local boards and appeal boards are filled on the basis of recommendations by the Governor of each State, with the appointments being made by the President.

Members of local boards and appeal boards receive no compensation. There are 38,916 persons representing about 90 percent of the total Selective Service personnel who work without pay.

The entire Selective Service System employs 4,344 full-time, paid civilians, and 2,057 part-time paid civilians. There is an average of about one paid clerk per board. The rest of the paid employees are largely clerks at State and National headquarters. There are only 50 persons in executive positions employed at the national headquarters and 207 employed at the 56 State and Territory headquarters.

The fiscal 1959 appropriation is \$27,500,000. Of this sum, \$20 million is spent in the operation of the local boards.

GENERAL EXPLANATION

H.R. 2260 extends the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act from the present expiration date of July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

The bill also extends until July 1, 1963, the suspension on the limitations on personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

Likewise, the bill extends the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to July 1, 1963.

Section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act contains the following provision:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1959, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist.

It should be noted that the Universal Military Training and Service Act is, for practical purposes, permanent law except for the authority to induct individuals not previously deferred.

The proposed legislation would extend the authority to induct such individuals from July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

The proposed legislation also seeks to extend the authority to make special calls for physicians and dentists.

H.R. 2260, as introduced, made permanent the authority to issue special calls for physicians and dentists by virtue of the fact that it would repeal the termination provision of the doctors' draft law.

The committee amended the bill so as to extend the authority to make special calls for physicians and dentists from July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years. The effect of the amendment is to extend the doctors' draft for 4 years, and not to make it permanent as the Department bill, by inadvertence, did.

The provision of law which permits the special call of physicians and dentists is contained in Public Law 85-62, commonly referred to as the doctors' draft law. Among the provisions of this law is an amendment to section 5(a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which contains the following proviso:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the President, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, from providing for the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups or from providing for the selection or induction of persons qualified in needed medical dental, or allied specialist categories pursuant to requisitions submitted by the Secretary of Defense.

This proviso must be considered in connection with a proviso of section 6(h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which states as follows:

And provided further, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces * * * until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth.

This is a most significant provision, particularly with respect to physicians and dentists. Most physicians and dentists are deferred to complete their medical and dental training and as a result they incur a liability up to age 35 under the above language.

Thus, these individuals are liable up to age 35 and may be called in a special category as medical and dental specialists because they were deferred to complete their medical and dental training.

This is the provision under which it is possible to induct physicians and dentists. Actually, no physicians and dentists are now being inducted, nor have any been inducted for some time.

This comes about as a result of section 4(l) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which authorizes the President to order to active duty for not more than 24 months with or without his consent any member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces who is in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category who has not attained the 35th anniversary of the date of his birth and who has not yet had at least 1 year of active duty.

As a result, physicians and dentists who are liable for induction apply for Reserve commissions and then are ordered to duty as Reserve officers usually in the grade of captain in the Army and Air Force, or lieutenant in the Navy.

The law specifically states that such individuals shall be appointed to a grade or rank commensurate with their education, experience, or ability. The law also provides that no person in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category shall be inducted if he applies or has applied for an appointment as a Reserve officer in any of these categories and is or has been rejected for such appointment on the sole ground of a physical disqualification.

Thus, physicians and dentists are entering the Armed Forces as Reserve officers, usually in the grade of captain in the Army and Air Force or lieutenant in the Navy, because the law specifically gives them the right to apply for a Reserve commission, and the law further gives the President the right to order them to active duty for not more than 24 months after they become Reserve officers, if they are not over the age of 35.

The law also provides that if a doctor is inducted as an enlisted man, he can be utilized in his professional capacity. It should also be noted that Reserve officers who enter on active duty as physicians and dentists also qualify for special pay which amounts to \$100 per month in the first 2 years of active duty.

In considering the extension of the doctors' draft law, the following personnel figures should be noted:

As of November 30, 1958, the Army had 1,629 Regular officers who were physicians, and 2,198 physicians who were Reserve officers. Of these 2,198 Reserve officer physicians, 1,579 entered the Army as a result of the doctors' draft law. These individuals were not drafted, but they entered as Reserve officers because of the doctors' draft law.

In the Navy, as of November 30, 1958, there were 1,626 Regular officer physicians and 1,672 Reserve officer physicians. Of this number, 1,186 Reserve officer physicians entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law.

In the Air Force, there were 1,144 Regular officer physicians and 2,274 Reserve officer physicians. Of these 2,274 Reserve officer physicians, 1,700 entered the Air Force as a result of the doctors' draft law.

The average annual rate of physicians on active duty to total personnel is 3.4 physicians per thousand troop strength. This strength figure varies throughout the year, but the overall average is 3.4.

All told, as of November 30, 1958, there were 10,543 physicians on active duty in the Armed Forces.

Dental personnel figures are as follows:

As of November 30, 1958, in the Army, there were 529 Regular dental officers and 1,250 Reserve dental officers. Of these 1,250 Reserve dental officers, 1,012 entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law.

In the Navy there were 1,012 Regular dental officers and 587 Reserve dental officers. Of these 587 Reserve dental officers, 513 entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law.

In the Air Force there were 441 Regular dental officers and 1,336 Reserve dental officers and of these 1,336 Reserve dental officers, 996 entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law. The average strength of dentists is 2 per thousand troop strength.

All told, there were 5,155 dentists on active duty on November 30, 1958.

It should be noted that all of the Reserve officers on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law entered on active duty prior to age 35. In addition, all of these doctors were at one time deferred to complete their education.

From these figures, it is clear to the Committee on Armed Services that the armed services would be unable to provide adequate medical and dental care for members of our Armed Forces if the doctors' draft law was not in operation.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

The proposed legislation also extends the present law which suspends the limitations on the size of the Armed Forces. Under existing permanent law the authorized active duty strength of the Army is limited to 837,000, and the Air Force is limited to 502,000 total active duty strength. This limitation has been suspended until July 1, 1959.

There are no statutory restrictions on the total number of naval personnel on active duty, but the total number of active Regular Navy enlisted personnel may not exceed an average of 500,000 during a fiscal year. Regular Navy officers are established by ratios to the Regular enlisted strength. It is anticipated that on July 1, 1959, there will be approximately 504,000 Regular enlisted Navy personnel on active duty and if the 500,000 limitation went into effect it would bring about a reduction in the size of the Navy.

The authorized strength of the Marine Corps has been codified at 400,000, and thus the Marine Corps would not be affected if the suspension expired.

The projected end strength of the Army on June 30, 1959, is 870,000, as contrasted with an authorized strength, now suspended, of 837,000.

The projected active duty strength of the Air Force on June 30, 1959, is 850,000; whereas the limitation, now suspended, only authorizes 502,000.

It is obvious, therefore, that unless these strength limitations are suspended there would be a drastic reduction in the size of the Air Force, a reduction of 33,000 in the size of the Army, and a small reduction in the size of the Navy.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

The proposed legislation also extends the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. This act went into effect at the outbreak of the Korean conflict and has been tied in closely with the draft law ever since.

This act authorizes the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to all enlisted members who have dependents, regardless of rank, provided the dependents are not furnished government quarters. Before the act was passed, enlisted members in pay grades E-1, E-2, and E-3 and enlisted members in pay grade E-4 with less than 7 years of service were not entitled to such an allowance.

The Dependents Assistance Act makes the payment of such an allowance contingent upon members making allotments payable to their dependents in an amount equal to that allowance plus a specified additional amount. If a member does not claim an allowance for his dependents, the Secretary concerned may direct the payment of the allowance.

Under this act, enlisted personnel in pay grades E-4 through E-9 receive a quarters allowance of \$77.10 per month if they have not more than two dependents, and \$96.90 per month if they have more than two dependents. Enlisted personnel in the grades E-1, E-2, and E-3 receive an allowance of \$51.30 per month with one dependent, \$77.10 per month with two dependents, and \$96.90 per month with over two dependents.

To qualify for these additional allowances, enlisted personnel in the grades E-1, E-2, and E-3 must allot \$40 of their basic pay monthly; in the grades E-4 and E-5 they must allot \$60 per month; and in the case of enlisted members in grades E-6 through E-9, they must allot \$80 per month.

This act expires on July 1, 1959, and if it is not extended enlisted personnel would suffer a severe reduction in pay.

HEARINGS

The committee conducted hearings on the proposed legislation during the week of January 26 through 30, 1959. Department of Defense witnesses, including two Assistant Secretaries of Defense, as well as the Military Chiefs or Deputy Chiefs of the services, the Director of Selective Service, the Surgeon General of the Army, presented testimony.

In addition, the committee received testimony from various religious organizations in opposition to the extension of the proposed legislation, as well as organizations in favor of the extension of the proposed legislation, including the National Guard Association.

In addition, the committee received a statement from the Secretary of Defense recommending the enactment of the proposed legislation, together with supporting statements from the Military Order of the World Wars, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Reserve Officers Association, and the Jewish War Veterans in favor of the proposed legislation, which have been inserted in the record of the hearings.

Statements in opposition to the proposed legislation from various organizations have also been inserted in the record of the hearings.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment is technical in nature. H.R. 2260 as originally introduced at the request of the Department of Defense would have made permanent the law which permits the President to make special calls for the selection or induction of persons qualified in needed medical, dental, or allied specialist categories. This provision of law was added as a temporary amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act by the Act of June 27, 1957. It was thus intended to be temporary law. By repealing section 9 of the act of June 27, 1957 (Public Law 85-62), this provision of law would have become permanent. The committee amendment amends the act of June 27, 1957, commonly referred to as the "doctors' draft law," by extending the termination date for the doctors' draft law which coincides with the termination date contained in the proposed legislation with respect to the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces as regular registrants.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Armed Services strongly recommends enactment of the proposed legislation, as amended. Its enactment is vital to the preservation of the American way of life and to our national security.

The Department of Defense strongly urges enactment of the proposed legislation, as indicated by the following attached letter from the Secretary of Defense.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 9, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it is in accord with the program of the President. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The principal purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, including special calls for the induction of persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, until July 1, 1963. Without such authority it would not be possible to maintain the military strength levels, Active and Reserve, deemed necessary to insure our national security.

In order to meet total military manpower requirements, it has been necessary to make consistent use of the draft authority during the past several years. In addition, the existence of the authority has stimulated many men to volunteer for military service. Many persons enlist in the service of their choice, enter ROTC or other officer programs, or enter Reserve programs in preference to being inducted. The loss of the draft authority would have adverse effects on all of these important programs.

Continuing authority is also needed to make special calls for physicians, dentists, and other medical specialists. Draft-inspired volunteers have been the principal source of medical and dental officers during the past several years. The act operates in such a manner that the required number of physicians and dentists affected by its provisions accept commissions and are subsequently ordered to active duty as commissioned officers.

Many steps have been taken to enhance the ability of the military departments to attract and retain qualified manpower by voluntary means. The Congress has been extremely helpful in this respect by providing legislation such as the military pay bill, the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act, and the Dependents Medical Care Act. It is apparent however, that volunteer programs alone will not meet all of the military manpower needs. We therefore regard the proposed legislation as absolutely imperative to the security of the Nation at this time and for the foreseeable future.

This proposal would also extend until July 1, 1963, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 655, 81st Cong.; 64 Stat. 408), as amended. In 1957, suspension of the limitation on the authorized active duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, as well as other limitations on the authorized personnel strength of other components and branches of the Armed Forces, was extended until July 1, 1959 (Public Law 85-63; 71 Stat. 208).

Active duty personnel requirements of the Armed Forces have exceeded basic legislative limitations since 1951. Congress has, in the past, recognized that it would be impossible for the Armed Forces to meet their commitments under the authorized strengths contained in existing law. Unless the suspension of the permanent personnel strength ceilings is continued, a substantial reduction from approximately 2,500,000 to approximately 2 million would be required. This would result in the demobilization of large segments of active combat and supporting elements, and clearly would be detrimental to national security in view of the continued uncertainty of world conditions.

Further, the proposal would also extend the Dependents Assistance Act, which otherwise would terminate on July 1, 1959. The 4-year extension coincides with the proposed extension of the induction authority. This is necessary to enable enlisted members with dependents to continue in receipt of increased allowances for quarters, thereby assuring adequate financial assistance for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, inducted or enlisted in the future, as well as those now on active duty. Termination of this legislation would impose undue financial hardship upon members who are ordered into the Armed Forces involuntarily. Additionally, to allow this legislation to expire would act as a deterrent to those who might otherwise volunteer for military service.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements within the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL McELROY.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 extends, from July 1, 1959, until July 1, 1963, the authority to induct persons into active training and service in the Armed Forces.

Section 2 extends, from July 1, 1959, until July 1, 1963, the suspension of personnel strengths of the Armed Forces made by the act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208).

Section 3 extends, from July 1, 1959, until July 1, 1963, the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (50 App. U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), relating to allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the Armed Forces.

Section 4, as amended, amends section 9 of the act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), the so-called Doctors' Draft Act, so as to extend the termination date of this act from July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows:

Existing Law

H.R. 2260

SEC. 17. * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1959, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2, title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 1, 1959.

SEC. 16. This Act, except sections 10, 11, and 12 hereof, shall terminate on July 1, 1959.

SEC. 9. This Act takes effect July 1, 1957, and shall terminate on July 1, 1959.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is repealed.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

[Report No. 27]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 12, 1959

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

FEBRUARY 2, 1959

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and
4 Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467 (c)), is
5 amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and
6 inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter
8 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out

1 the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1,
2 1963" in place thereof.

3 SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act
4 of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended
5 by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the
6 words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public
8 Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is ~~repealed~~ *amended by striking*
9 *out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July*
10 *1, 1963" in place thereof.*

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

[Report No. 27]

A BILL

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

By Mr. VINSON

JANUARY 12, 1959

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

FEBRUARY 2, 1959

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued February 4, 1959
For actions of February 3, 1959
86th-1st, No. 18

Acreage allotments.....	21
ASC committees.....	35
Awards.....	27
Budgeting.....	19
CCC.....	1
Civil service.....	2
Conservation.....	29
Cooperatives.....	14
Cotton.....	21
Depressed areas.....	32
Education.....	17
Farm program.....	13, 16, 25
Federal-State relations.....	10
Flood control.....	9
Foreign aid.....	15
Foreign trade.....	7
Forestry.....	6, 26, 33

Health.....	23
Holidays.....	30
Housing.....	5, 12
Item veto.....	31
Laboratories.....	29
Loans.....	4, 19
Milk program.....	11, 36
Personnel.....	18
Procurement.....	18
Property.....	22
Recreation.....	33
Reports.....	28
Rice.....	21
Selective service.....	3
Statehood.....	8
Surplus commodities.....	34
Veterans' loans.....	4, 19
Wheat quotas.....	24

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Proxmire criticized President's farm message recommendations on parity prices. Both Houses received from President annual report on CCC.

HOUSE

1. CCC. Both Houses received from the President the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1958. pp. 1493, 1544
2. CIVIL SERVICE. Both Houses received from the President the annual report of the Civil Service Commission. pp. 1493, 1543
3. SELECTIVE SERVICE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2260, to extend the Selective Service Act. p. 1547
4. VETERANS' LOANS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2256, to provide for additional direct loans to veterans. p. 1547
5. HOUSING. Received from the Budget Bureau a report on the operations of Budget Bureau Circular A-45, regarding the rental of housing by Federal agencies. p. 1546

6. FORESTRY. Received from the Interior Department a proposed bill "To add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 1546
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization a report on the administration of Section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 relative to the reduction in import duties which would threaten to impair the national security. p. 1546

SENATE

8. HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD. Received from New Mexico Legislature a resolution requesting Congress to admit Hawaii as a State. pp. 1493-4
9. FLOOD CONTROL. Received a Pennsylvania House of Representatives resolution requesting Congress to appropriate funds to finish the Shenango Reservoir Dam. Sen. Clark inserted his letter to the House Appropriations Committee urging this appropriation. p. 1494
10. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Sen. Murray criticized the administration's stand on transferring functions to State and local governments who, he said already have serious financial problems and high debts. He continued, "... the real problems must be met by Government -- Federal, State, or local," and inserted several articles supporting this position. pp. 1513-16
11. MILK PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire spoke on and inserted his statement on the family milk plan bill, stating that a Federal contribution will result in increased sales of milk at a lower price to needy families. pp. 1517-8
12. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to report the housing bill during adjournment. pp. 1519-25, 1542
13. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire criticized the President's farm message relating to parity. He stated, "These recommendations will wipe out the policy of our National Government of 25 years' standing to maintain fair economic treatment for farm people." Sens. Goldwater and Kuchel supported the administration's recommendations. pp. 1526-8
Sen. Morse inserted several articles stating the interrelationship between the farmers' economic conditions and those of the rest of the economy, the desire for high farm income and increased consumption, "flaws" in recent approaches to the problem, and new ideas in agriculture. pp. 1536-40
14. COOPERATIVES. Sen. Morse inserted a resolution of the Pacific Grain Growers, Inc. urging that Congress establish with finality the single tax policy toward co-operatives. p. 1536
15. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Wiley inserted a State Department report on the role the U. S. is playing in helping to meet the famine conditions in Northwestern Brazil, including action under Public Law 480. pp. 1540-1

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Johnson inserted a Wisc. Farmers Union telegram criticizing the President's farm message, and urging the use of surplus foods to aid foreign countries. p. A779
Rep. Lane inserted a newspaper editorial discussing the agricultural situation, and stating "something drastic must be done to restore and maintain a

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2260

FEBRUARY 3, 1959.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 153]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 153, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

(

House Calendar No. 14

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 153

[Report No. 29]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 3, 1959

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to
5 extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the
6 Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions
7 of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths
8 of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act
9 of 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to
10 the bill, and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be
11 equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking
12 minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the

1 bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule.
 2 At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amend-
 3 ment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the
 4 House with such amendments as may have been adopted,
 5 and the previous question shall be considered as ordered
 6 on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage with-
 7 out intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 14

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 153

[Report No. 29]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H.R. 2260, a bill to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

By Mr. COLMER

FEBRUARY 3, 1959

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued February 5, 1959
For actions of February 4, 1959
86th-1st, No. 19

Alaska.....	46		
Alcohol.....	30		
Budget.....	21		
Buildings.....	11		
Centennial celebration..	41		
Committee			
assignments.....	9,16		
Conservation.....	22,28		
Contracts.....	40		
Cotton.....	15,42		
Dairy products.....	36		
Depressed areas.....	34		
Education.....	23,31		
Electrification.....	26		
Employment.....	32		
Farm labor.....	33		
Farm program.....	8,19,37		
Flood control.....	3		
Food distribution.....	30		
Foreign aid.....	27		
Forestry.....	12,14		
Housing.....	1,6,7		
Land.....	12,35,45		
Loans.....	1,6,7		
Military training.....	2		
Minerals.....	14		
Monopolies.....	13		
Nominations.....	5		
Obligations.....	7		
Patents.....	43		
Personnel.....	24,29		
Postal service.....	18,44		
Prices, support.....	15		
Public Law 480			
extension.....	30		
Public works.....	32		
REA.....	26		
Recreation.....	35		
Statehood.....	4		
Sugar.....	47		
Surplus commodities.....	30		
Textiles.....	15,25,42		
Trade, foreign.....	10,17		
TVA.....	39		
Veterans.....	1,2,6,33,38		
Water pollution.....	20		
Watersheds.....	3		
Wetlands.....	22		
Wildlife.....	22		
Wool.....	17		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported nomination of Clarence Miller to be Asst. Secretary and CCC Board member. Senate debated housing bill. House passed veterans' housing loan bill. Rep. Quie introduced and discussed bill to extend Public Law 480 for 5 years. Rep. Wampler introduced and discussed depressed areas bill.

HOUSE

1. HOUSING. Passed with amendment, 310 to 89, H. R. 2256, to increase interest rates on veterans' loans from 4-3/4% to 5 1/2% and to authorize \$300,000,000 of additional direct veterans' loans in rural areas. pp. 1625-48
Rejected, 67 to 129, an amendment by Rep. Roosevelt to change the interest rate to 4-3/4 %. p. 1643
Rejected, 123 to 277, a motion by Rep. Teague to recommit the bill. p. 1647
2. DRAFT ACT EXTENSION. Began debate on H. R. 2260, to extend to July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. pp. 1648-49

3. WATERSHED IMPROVEMENTS. Received from the Budget Bureau a report on plans for works of improvement for the Lick Creek watershed, Tenn., and Chiltipin-San Fernando Creeks and San Diego-Rosita Creeks watersheds, Texas. p. 1656
Received from the Budget Bureau a report on plans for works of improvement for the West Hatchie Creek watershed, Miss.; Muddy Creek watershed, N. C.; and Tewaukon watershed, N. D. and S. D. p. 1656

4. HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered favorably reported H. R. 50, providing for statehood for Hawaii. p. D66

SENATE

5. NOMINATIONS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported the nomination of Clarence L. Miller to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and a member of the CCC Board of Directors. pp. 1554, D64

6. HOUSING. Began debate on S. 57, the housing bill (pp. 1572-6, 1580-1620). The bill had been reported with amendment on Feb. 3 by the Banking and Currency Committee under the authority of a Senate order (S. Rept. 41) (p. 1549).

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Cooper to reduce the authorization for direct loans to veterans from \$300 million to \$150 million. pp. 1618-20

Rejected, 32 to 58, an amendment in the nature of a substitute by Sen. Capehart which would have substituted the language of the administration-sponsored housing bill. pp. 1600-13

Received from the Budget Bureau a report on the operations of Budget Bureau Circular A-45, regarding the rental of housing by Federal agencies. p. 1549

7. FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS. Sen. Robertson inserted several tables showing "long range commitments and contingencies of the U. S. Government as of June 18, 1958," including those relating to several programs of this Department. pp. 1572-6

8. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "agreed to invite Secretary of Agriculture Benson to appear before it sometime during the week of February 16 to discuss the President's farm recommendations." p. D64

9. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee announced the appointment of membership to its standing subcommittees, as follows (p. D64):
"(1) Soil Conservation and Forestry--Senators Eastland, chairman, Johnston (South Carolina), Proxmire, Talmadge, Young (Ohio), Aiken, Hickenlooper, and Schoeppel; (2) Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification--Senators Holland, chairman, Talmadge, Symington, Hart, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Williams; (3) Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices--Senators Johnston, chairman, Holland, Humphrey, Proxmire, Jordan, Aiken, Young, and Mundt, and (4) Agricultural Research and General Legislation--Senators Humphrey, chairman, Eastland, Symington, Jordan, Hickenlooper, Williams, and Young. Senator Ellender will be an ex officio member of each of these subcommittees."

10. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization a report on the administration of Sec. 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1959 relative to the reduction in import duties which would threaten to impair the national security. p. 1550

11. FOREIGN BUILDINGS. Both Houses received from the State Department a proposed bill "To amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926"; to S. Foreign Relations and H. Foreign Affairs Committees. pp. 1550, 1656

Direct loans have not been made in the Cleveland urban area—but in the 38 rural counties the following direct loans were made:

Year	Number	Amount
1954	273	\$2,090,346
1955	461	3,610,736
1956	226	1,699,251
1957	523	4,213,972
1958	245	2,097,033

In our cities the adoption of the amendment permitting cities to apply for designation as "housing credit shortage areas" may make GI loans available to minority groups which now suffer a maximum need for home-loan borrowings. It is my hope that the administrator of this program will seriously consider the needs of these veterans who have been almost completely disregarded in the housing program to date.

While I vigorously protest the three-stage inflationary rise in interest rates which will be precipitated by this legislation, I believe that it is essential to the veteran and to the economy that there be a revitalization in the GI home building program. I hope that this measure will live up to promised expectations in that regard.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans; to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 154, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of California moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Veterans Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all of section 1.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 123, nays 277, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—123

Adair	Devine	Mumma
Alger	Dooley	Nelsen
Allen	Dwyer	Norblad
Arends	Fenton	O'Brien, N.Y.
Auchincloss	Ford	Osmer
Avery	Frelinghuysen	Ostertag
Ayres	Glenn	Pelly
Baker	Griffin	Pillion
Barry	Gross	Pirnie
Bass, N.H.	Gubser	Poff
Bates	Halleck	Quile
Baumhart	Henderson	Ray
Becker	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Belcher	Hiestand	Rees, Kans.
Bentley	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Berry	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Betts	Hoffman, Mich.	Roblson
Boland	Holt	St. George
Bolton	Horan	Schenck
Bosch	Hosmer	Scherer
Bow	Johansen	Schwengel
Broomfield	Jonas	Short
Brown, Ohio	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Broyhill	Keith	Simpson, Pa.
Budge	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Lafore	Springer
Cahill	Laird	Taber
Cederberg	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Chamberlain	Latta	Thomson, Wyo.
Chenoweth	Lindsay	Tollefson
Chlperfield	Lipscomb	Utt
Church	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Collier	McDonough	Wainwright
Conte	McIntire	Wallhauser
Cramer	Mack, Wash.	Weaver
Cunningham	Melliard	Wels
Curtin	Mason	Westland
Curtis, Mass.	May	Wharton
Dague	Mich	Wldnall
Derounlan	Milliken	Wilson
Derwinski	Minshall	Younger

NAYS—277

Abbitt	Cannon	Garmatz
Abernethy	Casey	Gary
Addonizio	Celler	Gathings
Albert	Clark	Gavin
Alexander	Coad	George
Alford	Coffin	Gialmo
Andersen	Cohelan	Granahan
Minn.	Colmer	Grant
Anderson	Cooley	Gray
Mont.	Corbett	Green, Oreg.
Andrews	Daddario	Griffiths
Anfuso	Daniels	Haley
Ashley	Davis, Ga.	Hall
Ashmore	Davis, Tenn.	Halpern
Aspinall	Delaney	Hardy
Bailey	Dent	Hargis
Baldwin	Denton	Harmon
Barden	Diggs	Harris
Baring	Dingell	Harrison
Barr	Dollinger	Hays
Bass, Tenn.	Dorn, N.Y.	Healey
Beckworth	Dorn, S.C.	Hébert
Bennett, Fla.	Dowdy	Hechler
Bennett, Mich.	Downing	Hemphill
Blatnik	Doyle	Herlong
Bltch	Dulski	Hogan
Boggs	Durham	Holifield
Bolling	Edmondson	Holland
Bonner	Elliott	Holtzman
Bowles	Everett	Huddleston
Boykin	Evins	Hull
Boyle	Fallon	Ikard
Brademas	Fascell	Irwin
Bray	Felghan	Jarman
Breeding	Fino	Jennings
Brewster	Fisher	Johnson, Calif.
Brock	Flood	Johnson, Colo.
Brooks, La.	Flynn	Johnson, Md.
Brooks, Tex.	Flynt	Johnson, Wis.
Brown, Ga.	Foley	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Mo.	Forand	Jones, Mo.
Burdick	Forrester	Karsten
Burke, Ky.	Fountain	Karth
Burke, Mass.	Frazier	Kasem
Burleson	Friedel	Kastenmeyer
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton	Kearns
Canfield	Gallagher	Kee

Kelly	Morris, N. Mex.	Saylor
Keogh	Morris, Okla.	Scott
Kilday	Moss	Selden
Kilgore	Moulder	Shelley
King, Calif.	Multer	Sheppard
King, Utah	Murphy	Shipley
Kirwan	Natcher	Sikes
Kitchin	Nix	Siler
Kluczynski	Norrell	Sisk
Knox	O'Brien, Ill.	Slack
Kowalski	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Iowa
Landrum	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Lane	O'Konski	Smith, Va.
Lankford	O'Neill	Spence
Lesinski	Oliver	Stagers
Levering	Patman	Steed
Libonati	Perkins	Stratton
Loser	Pfost	Stubblefield
McCormack	Philbin	Sullivan
McDowell	Pilcher	Teague, Tex.
McFall	Pogge	Teller
McGinley	Polk	Thomas
McGovern	Porter	Thompson, La.
McMillan	Price	Thompson, N.J.
Macdonald	Prokop	Thompson, Tex.
Machrowicz	Pucinski	Thornberry
Mack, Ill.	Quigley	Toll
Madden	Rabaut	Trimble
Magnuson	Rains	Tuck
Mahon	Reuss	Udall
Marshall	Rhodes, Pa.	Ullman
Matthews	Riley	Vanik
Marrow	Rivers, Alaska	Van Zandt
Metcalfe	Rivers, S.C.	Vinson
Meyer	Roberts	Walter
Miller	Rodino	Wampler
Clement W.	Rogers, Colo.	Watts
Miller,	Rogers, Fla.	Wier
George P.	Rogers, Mass.	Williams
Mills	Rogers, Tex.	Willis
Mitchell	Rooney	Winstead
Moeller	Roosevelt	Wolf
Monagan	Rostenkowski	Wright
Montoya	Roush	Yates
Moore	Rutherford	Young
Moorhead	Santangelo	Zablocki
Morgan	Saund	

NOT VOTING—34

Barrett	Fogarty	Passman
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Powell
Bush	Hagen	Preston
Carnahan	Jackson	Reed
Carter	Jensen	Smith, Calif.
Chelf	Lennon	Taylor
Cook	McSween	Whitener
Curtis, Mo.	Martin	Whitten
Dawson	Meader	Withrow
Dixon	Miller, N.Y.	Zelenko
Donohue	Morrison	
Farbstein	Murray	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Preston against.

Mr. Reed for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carter with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Withrow.

The result of the vote was announced

as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, on that ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 310, nays 89, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—310

Abbitt	Adair	Albert
Abernethy	Addonizio	Alexander

Alford
Andersen,
Minn.
Anderson,
Mont.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Baring
Barr
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bowles
Boykin
Boyle
Brademas
Bray
Breeding
Brewster
Brock
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Burdick
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Canfield
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Chenoweth
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Dorn, N.Y.
Dorn, S.C.
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durham
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynn
Flynt
Foley
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton

Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Glaimo
Glenn
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hardy
Hargis
Harmon
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Healey
Hebert
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hogan
Hollifield
Holland
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kasem
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Klirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lesinski
Levering
Libonati
Loser
McCormack
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McGinley
McGovern
McMillan
McSween
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Morrow
Metcalf
Meyer
Miller
Clement W.
Miller
George P.
Milliken
Mills
Mitchell
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan

Morris, N. Mex.
Morris, Okla.
Moss
Moulder
Mutter
Murphy
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Oliver
Patman
Perkins
Prest
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Polk
Porter
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Quile
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Reece, Tenn.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Wampler
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Widnall
Wier
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—89

Alger
Allen
Arends
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Becker
Berry
Bolton
Bosch
Bow
Broomfield
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chilperfield
Church
Collier
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Derounlan
Derwinski
Devine
Dooley
Ford
Frelinghuysen

Griffin
Halleck
Henderson
Hess
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Johansen
Jonas
Judd
Keith
Kilburn
Lafore
Laird
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McDonough
McIntire
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Mason
May
Michel
Minshall
Mumma
Nelsen

Norblad
Osmer
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Ray
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robison
St. George
Scherer
Schwengel
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Springer
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wyo.
Utt
Van Pelt
Wainwright
Weis
Wharton
Wilson
Younger

NOT VOTING 35

Barrett
Buckley
Bush
Carnahan
Carter
Chelf
Cook
Curtis, Mo.
Dawson
Dixon
Donohue
Evins

Farbstein
Fogarty
Green, Pa.
Hagen
Jackson
Jensen
Lennon
Martin
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Murray

Passman
Powell
Preston
Reed
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Taylor
Whitener
Whitten
Withrow
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Reed against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carter with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Dixon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO CORRECT PARAGRAPH AND SECTION NUMBERS OF H.R. 2256

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized in the engrossment of the bill to correct paragraphs and sections thereof because of the amendment

offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES, AND DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 153) providing for the consideration of H.R. 2260, a bill to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and I now yield myself such time as I may briefly consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to extend the draft, as it is commonly known. The bill would provide briefly for the extension of this authority to induct our young men into the armed services for a period of 4 years. It would extend the so-called doctor's draft law from its present expiration date, July 1, 1959, to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years. It extends the suspension on a strength limitation of the Armed Forces from the present termination date to 1963. It extends the Dependents' Assistance Act. Briefly, that is what the bill does.

Now, in the hearing before the Committee on Rules there was no opposition expressed to that committee in the granting of a rule for the extension of the act itself, although there was some testimony to the effect that possibly it should be limited to a 2-year period.

I am one of those who will go along with this bill reluctantly. I say reluc-

tantly because I regret the necessity for the continuation of the so-called draft; but as long as we have the situation that exists in the world today; that is, a bad neighbor on the other side for whom this country did so much when it had its back against the wall, we must have adequate defense for the possibility—and I use the word advisedly—of an attack from that potential enemy.

Frankly, I still subscribe to the theory that the Russians want neither war or peace but that they want to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy and then take over in the ensuing chaos, a statement I have been making in the well of this House for the past 12 years. On the other hand, we cannot take the chance of not being prepared to prevent their provoking hostilities, because if we become too weak they would take advantage of that situation and would overrun us, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I regret the necessity for an extension of this legislation which would draft our young men into service and interrupt the orderly continuity of their lives, but with the situation being what it is and this being the fairest method of approach to military service, I urge the adoption of this resolution and ask for the careful consideration of the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of H.R. 2260, a bill to extend until July 1, 1963, the Universal Military Training and Service Act. It is an open rule and provides for 5 hours of general debate. The Rules Committee provided for long debate because they realized this bill is extremely controversial.

Some believe the present law is discriminatory and inequitable; that it is inefficient and is administered extravagantly and wastefully.

Other conscientious people believe conscription is alien to the American tradition.

For these reasons an open rule is provided making the bill open to amendments.

While I am aware that some are opposed to this bill I am not aware of any one opposing the rule.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

[Mr. ARENDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk this afternoon about the Federal deficit. There is another spending scheme that we will be called upon to take over, and it should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

About a month ago there was established in the United Nations a new

agency called the "Special Fund" which hopes to have \$2 billion to \$5 billion to hand out annually. Named as managing director is one, Paul G. Hoffman, and he is peculiarly fitted for the job. He could not make a success of the Studebaker company so, in 1949, President Truman made him the directing genius of the foreign giveaway setup—the Economic Cooperation Administration, as it was then known.

What could be more fitting? Hoffman could not make a success of his own business so he was given the job of distributing billions of dollars to panhandlers all over the world.

Then came 1952, and this top-graded employee of the New Deal internationalists showed up as a modern Republican. Since then he has flitted in and out of the Eisenhower administration with the greatest of ease, as have others who were bosom pals of the New Dealers when they were riding high in the White House.

Now Hoffman has landed on his feet again, undoubtedly with White House approval, as managing director of the innocuous-sounding United Nations Special Fund. What does Hoffman want? As we said earlier—only \$2 billion to \$5 billion a year.

Where are these billions to be obtained? They are to be drawn, says Hoffman, from individual Government lending agencies such as the World Bank, American foreign aid, and private investment.

But the Chicago Tribune news service quotes Hoffman as saying: "We will take money wherever we can get it."

No one knowing the record will doubt that.

Already, funds from one specific source are assured. The U.N. General Assembly, when it set up the Special Fund, specified that 40 percent of the costs are to be defrayed by the United States and the rest by other contributing governments.

What other contributing governments? If experience with some other U.N. funds is any criterion, American taxpayers will put up the cash and anything else contributed will be the air in the bag they have been left holding.

Incidentally, this is another example of how an aggregation of foreigners, plus some of our own internationalists, can sit down in New York or some far away place and vote what amounts to an indirect tax levy on the American people.

What is the purpose of this United Nations Special Fund? To aid "underdeveloped countries," of course, and it is reported that Hoffman is showing great interest in the development of the lower Mekong River Basin which stretches for 2,800 miles through Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam.

From South Bend, Ind., to the United Nations in New York, to the Mekong River in southeast Asia is quite a jump even for a more than ordinary dogooder, but with a few stopovers in Washington, with the proper New Deal-modern Republican approach, and with the experience of spending a few billions of other people's money, it appears that the necessary agility can be developed.

We would like to put the Appropriations Committee on notice now that when the spending bills come rolling to the House floor we will be looking for further information concerning this new multi-billion-dollar special fund and the activities in connection therewith of Managing Director Paul G. Hoffman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this rule. I remember one night a good many years ago when the draft bill came up for debate. I remember the extreme tenseness of the House, the feeling of opposition to the draft, but I voted for it and I remember that that bill passed by only one vote.

Some time I would like to tell some of the Members of the arguments I heard before the bill came up. I never regretted that vote for one instant because we were viciously attacked by Japan just a few weeks afterward.

Today a little Boy Scout named Murphy from my district gave me one of the Scout pins that we see in the lapels of so many Members of the House and I was very proud.

That boy is 12 years old, one of the finest youngsters I have ever seen. He is learning to speak Russian in order to understand the Russian people so that we may be protected. He knows a good deal of Russian as it is. After talking with him I could not vote for anything but continuation of the draft, unpleasant as it may be. He is preparing every way he can. He sets a great example.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TO AMEND SECTION 200 OF THE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 3313, to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, be rereferred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

FIRE SAFETY IN THE SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the law the Congress of the United States is responsible for the welfare and protection of the District of Columbia, and I have always considered it a great privilege to serve on the committee in

Congress which has this responsibility under its jurisdiction. Accordingly, when the country was shocked by the tragic fire which occurred in Chicago on December 1, 1958, when some 90 schoolchildren were trapped and met their death in a devastating fire, I was reminded of my own responsibility as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and I decided to find out if the schools in the District were properly equipped and secured against any similar tragedy. Even though investigations of the cause of the Chicago fire revealed there were no violations of the law or regulations, nevertheless it was disclosed that that particular school building did not have the fire safety provisions required of new structures, and such a revelation gives one pause for thought. Schoolchildren are entitled to every protection possible no matter when their school building may have been built and it is the duty of the Congress as the responsible governing body of the District to see that they get it.

Therefore, under date of December 3, 1958, I addressed a letter to M. H. Sutton, fire chief of the District of Columbia, asking about the fire safety conditions in all the schools in the District—public, private, and parochial. A copy of my letter to the chief is appended at the end of my remarks, marked "Exhibit A."

In reply to my letter Chief Sutton sent the Fire Marshal of the District, Raymond C. Roberts, to see me, and I had a most informative and frank discussion with him. As a result of our talk, Fire Marshal Roberts submitted a report to Chief Sutton, dated January 21, 1959, and the Chief sent a copy of it to me in a letter dated January 23, 1959. This report is printed at the close of my remarks, exhibit B.

I would like to point out some of the features of this report that should have the prompt attention of the District Committee.

The Fire Marshal advises:

Enclosing of all vertical shafts such as stairways and elevator shafts and providing floor fire cutoffs with fire doors plus the installation of an automatic sprinkler system is the only way to hold to a minimum the loss of life and property from fire in the older non-fire-resistive constructed buildings.

This statement by an expert is a matter for close and thorough consideration by the District Committee which I am sure will be undertaken.

Under the title of "Fire Doors" the Fire Marshal reports that:

Fire doors are required to be installed by the Building Code of the District of Columbia in every new school erected. New construction is not the problem confronting us today.

He reports further that—

As of this year, with the already available funds, it is expected that every elementary school coming under the District of Columbia Board of Education will be equipped with interior enclosed stairways.

This, of course, is most reassuring, but he goes on to say:

To the best of my knowledge there is no such plan or program to bring the private and parochial schools up to present code requirements.

This state of affairs should be corrected and there is no doubt that our

committee will give it appropriate attention.

The fire marshal calls attention to an exception made in certain instances to the use of fire extinguishers as follows:

Fire extinguishers are required to be installed in every school by the building code of the District of Columbia with the exception of buildings not more than two stories in height having enclosed stairs and having a gross floor area in the second story of not more than 3,000 square feet.

I am pleased to note the following statement in this report, however, but I wonder if the recommendation should not have the force and the authority of law back of it:

In an effort to correct this, the fire chief will recommend to the Director, Department of Licenses and Inspections, District of Columbia, that the building code of the District of Columbia be amended by deleting the above referred to exception.

To the best of our knowledge all schools with the exception of those schools used which do not require extinguishers because of the exception in the code, are provided with fire extinguishers, adequate in number of an approved type, and maintained properly.

In speaking of the local private fire alarm system, the fire marshal reports that:

Private fire alarm systems (for evacuation purposes only) are required to be installed in every school by the building code of the District of Columbia with the exception of buildings not more than two stories in height having enclosed stairs and having a gross floor area in the second story of not more than 3,000 square feet.

It is good to have the assurance which follows that:

To the best of our knowledge all schools with the exception of those schools used which do not require private fire alarm systems because of the exception in the code, are provided with local fire alarm systems in an operable condition.

The exception provided for in this rule should have the attention and study of the committee.

Emergency lighting, of course, is important and Fire Marshal Roberts reports in part as follows on this matter:

The requirements as to when they (light) shall be used as well as exceptions as to when it will not be necessary to have the lights burning are contained in the electrical code of the District of Columbia. It is my feeling that these exceptions to the code and indefinite requirements are unwarranted, and in an effort to correct this, the fire chief will recommend to the Director, Department of Licenses and Inspections, District of Columbia, that all reference to maintenance of emergency lights be deleted from the electrical code. Simultaneously a recommendation will be made to make the maintenance of emergency lighting a part of the police regulations thereby making it a responsibility of the fire department.

Why any exceptions should be made in emergency lighting should have the careful consideration of the committee.

Everyone knows that fire exit drills are most important and I have always thought they were a regular part of the school curriculum so I was not only surprised but somewhat startled to read this in the fire marshal's report:

Schools under the public school system in my opinion hold an adequate number of

fire exit drills during the course of each school year, however, the occurrence of such drills during the first 3 months of school is a matter of concern. Private and parochial schools do not, in my opinion, hold an adequate number of fire exit drills during the course of each school year. Inquiry has developed the facts that fire exit drills are not held with the frequency deemed adequate. At the present time there are no regulations requiring fire exit drills.

Something must be done to correct this situation even if it is necessary to enact a law to bring this about; I am surprised to learn from the report that the executives of some schools do not consider this important.

In the event of a fire perhaps the most important factor to prevent panic and save life is the facility to summon the fire department; any delay in securing its aid may well be disastrous. The following excerpt from the Fire Marshal's report is most disturbing.

Facilities for calling the fire department are generally limited to the use of the telephone or by sounding an alarm through the use of a municipal fire alarm box. A municipal fire alarm box within a reasonable distance (300 feet) is not available at every school nor does every school have a telephone. The telephone alone should not be accepted as adequate for the transmission of an alarm of fire. A municipal fire alarm box connected directly with the fire department is the most reliable form of transmitting an alarm of fire.

As far as I can learn there are 83 school buildings that either have no telephone or are located further than three hundred feet from any municipal fire alarm box. This is a most serious matter and should be corrected without delay. I am in favor of a law requiring that a fire alarm box be installed in every school building, hospital, nursing home, and place of assembly in the District. In that way as nearly as is humanly possible assistance is assured without delay, many injuries avoided and lives saved.

These are a few of the highlights of this excellent and informative report, and I hope my colleagues will read it and add their comments, criticisms, and suggestions for the benefit of the District Committee. I know I speak for the members of this committee when I say that they are as interested as I am in the welfare and protection of our children and of the sick in the District of Columbia. I am confident that the District Committee will go into all these matters with scrupulous care, and if legislation is indicated, will present it promptly to the House for its consideration.

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 3, 1958.

Chief MILLARD H. SUTTON,
District of Columbia Fire Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHIEF SUTTON: In the light of the recent horrible fire disaster in Chicago it is natural that we should do everything possible to see that our own city is properly safeguarded. Therefore, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am writing to ask you as fire chief of the District of Columbia if provisions for safety against fire are fully carried out by all the schools in the District

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued February 6, 1959
For actions of February 5, 1959
86th-1st, No. 20

Adjournment.....	5		
Alcohol.....	24		
Budget.....	3		
Budgeting.....	11		
Buildings.....	28		
Conservation.....	15		
Contracts.....	4, 21, 28		
Crop insurance.....	31		
Depressed areas.....	35		
Draft extension.....	1		
Education.....	39, 40		
Electrification.....	32		
Expenditures.....	8		
Farm program.....	7, 18, 23		
Farm units.....	38		
Flood control.....	17		
Food additives.....	37		
Food distribution.....	24		
Forestry.....	12		
Gasoline tax.....	36		
Grain.....	31		
Holidays.....	30		
Housing.....	6	Retirement.....	33
Industrial uses.....	34	River basin.....	38
Inflation.....	10, 16	Rural development.....	20
Inter-American relations.....	2	Soil bank.....	31
Lands.....	25	Statehood.....	27
Loans.....	6	Surplus commodities.....	22, 24
Military training.....	1	Taxation.....	36
Minerals.....	25	Veterans' loans.....	6, 39
Monopolies.....	26	Water pollution.....	19
Oranges.....	13	Water resources.....	14
Personnel.....	30, 33	Watersheds.....	9
REA.....	32	Weather.....	29

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed housing bill. Sen. Scott commended administration farm policies.

HOUSE

1. DRAFT EXTENSION. Passed, 381 to 20, as reported H. R. 2260, to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Services Act. pp. 1662-90
Rejected, amendment by Rep. Wolf to extend the Act for 2 years only. pp. 1684-8
Rejected a motion by Rep. Mason to recommit the bill. p. 1689
2. INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS. Rep. Sikes spoke in support of more cooperation between the U. S. and the Latin American countries and of the establishment of an Inter-American Bank to achieve this end. pp. 1695-6
3. BUDGET. Rep. Mack urged a balanced budget and inserted figures showing the amount of money required from each state and from cities and counties in Washington to balance the budget. pp. 1696-8
4. GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS. Both Houses received ^{from the Labor Department} a proposed bill, "To establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts"; to House Judiciary Committee and Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. pp. 1704, 1708

5. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 9. p. 1703

SENATE

6. HOUSING. Passed, 60 to 28, with amendments S. 57, the housing bill. pp. 1717-88
Rejected, 27 to 58, an amendment by Sen. Monroney which would have continued interest rates on veterans' housing loans at 4-3/4 percent instead of permitting a rise to 5-1/4 percent. pp. 1762-85
7. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Scott commended the administration's farm policies, expressed the hope that Congress "can produce a body of agricultural legislation at this session which will eliminate the shackles on the farmer's efficiency and help him to help himself," and inserted a newspaper editorial supporting his position. p. 1789
8. EXPENDITURES. Several Senators discussed recent Federal expenditures and the responsibility for increased expenditures, and Sen. Case, S. Dak., inserted a tabular recapitulation of itemized estimates and appropriations for the first session of the 85th Congress. pp. 1723-31
9. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau a report on plans for works of improvement in Miss., N. C., N. Dak., and S. Dak.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. pp. 1707-8
Received from the Budget Bureau a report on plans for works of improvement in Tenn. and Tex.; to Public Works Committee. p. 1708
10. INFLATION. Sen. Goldwater criticized proposals for increased Federal spending as being inflationary, and inserted a magazine article, "Dollar War At Home." pp. 1713-14
11. BUDGETING. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau a report that CCC administrative expenses have been apportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental authorization for 1959.
12. FORESTRY. Sen. Case, S. Dak., was appointed to the National Forest Reservation Commission. p. 1789
13. ORANGES. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 79, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to permit the continuance of the practice of coloring oranges. p. D70

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Johnson inserted an article discussing the efforts made by Texans to control and utilize water resources. p. A840
15. CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley commending the conservation programs in Wis. and inserting an article praising an 11 year old constituent. p. A842
16. INFLATION. Sen. Dirksen inserted an article, "Cut Federal Spending--Inflation Can Be Licked, Experts Agree, But Congress and the Executive Must Quit Playing Politics." pp. A842-3
Rep. Abbutt inserted an article, "Federal Tax, Spending Policy Biggest Danger Facing United States." p. A849



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 105

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1959

No. 20

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jeremiah 33: 2-3: Thus saith the Lord, call unto Me and I will answer thee and show thee great and mighty things which thou knowest not.

Almighty God, who art the inspiration of our loftiest aspirations, may we determine to bring them to fulfillment and fruition.

Grant that the ideals and principles of the lowly Man of Galilee may have the place of preeminence in all our national and international affairs.

Enlarge our faith; guide us by Thy divine counsel; give us those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy; establish within us those loyalties and integrities which cannot be spoken.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT

MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., January 31, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1959: Hon. HERBERT ZELENSKO, New York; Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, Virginia; Hon. JOHN H. RAY, New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board. Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Two principles basic to our system of government are that the rule of law is supreme, and that every individual regardless of his race, religion, or national origin is entitled to the equal protection of the laws. We must continue to seek every practicable means for reinforcing these principles and making them a reality for all.

The United States has a vital stake in striving wisely to achieve the goal of full equality under law for all people. On several occasions I have stated that progress toward this goal depends not on laws alone but on building a better understanding. It is thus important to remember that any further legislation in this field must be clearly designed to continue the substantial progress that has taken place in the past few years. The recommendations for legislation which I am making have been weighed and formulated with this in mind.

First, I recommend legislation to strengthen the law dealing with obstructions of justice so as to provide expressly that the use of force or threats of force to obstruct court orders in school desegregation cases shall be a Federal offense.

There have been instances where extremists have attempted by mob violence and other concerted threats of violence to obstruct the accomplishment of the objectives in school decrees. There is a serious question whether the present obstruction-of-justice statute reaches such

acts of obstruction which occur after the completion of the court proceedings. Nor is the contempt power a satisfactory enforcement weapon to deal with persons who seek to obstruct court decrees by such means.

The legislation that I am recommending would correct a deficiency in the present law and would be a valuable enforcement power on which the Government could rely to deter mob violence and such other acts of violence or threats which seek to obstruct court decrees in desegregation cases.

Second, I recommend legislation to confer additional investigative authority on the FBI in the case of crimes involving the destruction or attempted destruction of schools or churches, by making flight from one State to another to avoid detention or prosecution for such a crime a Federal offense.

All decent, self-respecting persons deplore the recent incidents of bombings of schools and places of worship. While State authorities have been diligent in their execution of local laws dealing with these crimes, a basis for supplementary action by the Federal Government is needed.

Such recommendation when enacted would make it clear that the FBI has full authority to assist in investigations of crimes involving bombings of schools and churches. At the same time, the legislation would preserve the primary responsibility for law enforcement in local law enforcement agencies for crimes committed against local property.

Third, I recommend legislation to give the Attorney General power to inspect Federal election records, and to require that such records be preserved for a reasonable period of time so as to permit such inspection.

The right to vote, the keystone of democratic self-government, must be available to all qualified citizens without discrimination. Until the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Government could protect this right only through criminal prosecutions instituted after the right had been infringed. The 1957 act attempted to remedy this deficiency by authorizing the Attorney Gen-

eral to institute civil proceedings to prevent such infringements before they occurred.

A serious obstacle has developed which minimizes the effectiveness of this legislation. Access to registration records is essential to determine whether the denial of the franchise was in furtherance of a pattern of racial discrimination. But during preliminary investigations of complaints the Department of Justice, unlike the Civil Rights Commission, has no authority to require the production of election records in a civil proceeding. State or local authorities, in some instances, have refused to permit the inspection of their election records in the course of investigations. Supplemental legislation, therefore, is needed.

Fourth. I recommend legislation to provide a temporary program of financial and technical aid to State and local agencies to assist them in making the necessary adjustments required by school desegregation decisions.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be authorized to assist and cooperate with those States which have previously required or permitted racially segregated public schools, and which must now develop programs of desegregation. Such assistance should consist of sharing the burdens of transition through grants-in-aid to help meet additional costs directly occasioned by desegregation programs, and also of making technical information and assistance available to State and local educational agencies in preparing and implementing desegregation programs.

I also recommend that the Commissioner of Education be specifically authorized, at the request of the State or local agencies, to provide technical assistance in the development of desegregation programs and to initiate or participate in conferences called to help resolve educational problems arising as a result of efforts to desegregate.

Fifth. I recommend legislation to authorize, on a temporary basis, provision for the education of children of members of the Armed Forces when State-administered public schools have been closed because of desegregation decisions or orders.

The Federal Government has a particular responsibility for the children of military personnel in federally affected areas, since armed services personnel are located there under military orders rather than of their own free choice. Under the present law, the Commissioner of Education may provide for the education of children of military personnel only in the case of those who live on military reservations or other Federal property. The legislation I am recommending would remove this limitation.

Sixth. I recommend that Congress give consideration to the establishing of a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts.

Nondiscrimination in employment under Government contracts is required by Executive orders. Through education, mediation, and persuasion, the existing Committee on Government Contracts

has sought to give effect not only to this contractual obligation, but to the policy of equal job opportunities generally. While the program has been widely accepted by Government agencies, employers and unions, and significant progress has been made, full implementation of the policy would be materially advanced by the creation of a statutory Commission.

Seventh. I recommend legislation to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 2 years. While the Commission should make an interim report this year within the time originally fixed by law for the making of its final report, because of the delay in getting the Commission appointed and staffed, an additional 2 years should be provided for the completion of its task and the making of its final report.

I urge the prompt consideration of these seven proposals.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 1959.

STATUTORY RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS

(Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent to the Congress, today, an important message on constitutional and statutory rights of individuals, and the rule of law, under our system of government.

It is a temperate message. It is a moderate message. It is a message of the golden mean.

It would be repetitious for me to discuss the seven specific recommendations of the President, so soon after the reading of the message, but I do commend its careful reading and deep study to every citizen who is interested in solving one of the difficult problems of our time.

STATE COMPACT REGARDING UNIFORM TAX TREATMENT OF NON-RESIDENTS

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill on behalf of myself and my Democratic colleagues granting the consent of Congress to the several States to enter into compacts providing for the uniform tax treatment of nonresidents.

An interstate compact can obtain substantial relief and is much more likely to obtain congressional support than a constitutional amendment. To begin with, the compact bill we are offering requires only a simple majority in both Houses of Congress. In giving its approval, Congress is merely authorizing the States to work out reciprocal tax agreements regarding nonresidents. When those agreements have been made, the States will be further required to submit their compacts to Congress for ultimate approval.

If the States can work out amicable agreements there will be no difficulty in

obtaining final congressional approval. Under the measure we are sponsoring, consent is not limited to the States engaged in tax controversy with New Jersey but is available to all of the States. Such States, for example, as North and South Dakota, Maryland, and Virginia, are presently having nonresident tax difficulties and under our legislation will be authorized to enter into separate agreements.

We hope that Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia in particular will follow the lead of the State of New York and ameliorate the unfair wage tax it presently levies on New Jersey residents who work there.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted to the following Members of the House: Messrs. MEADER, MILLER of New York, and CHELF. They will be absent on official business through February 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, HOUSE MEETS AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next when there will be a joint meeting in connection with the 150th anniversary of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln, the House meet at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next the Speaker may declare a recess at any time during that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2260 with the

gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today, the bill to extend the draft, is one of the most important bills that will be considered by the 86th Congress during this session.

It is a Department of Defense bill.

It is a bill that involves the security of our Nation.

As far as I am concerned, we have no choice but to pass this bill.

Now the bill does four things:

First, it extends the authority to induct individuals for a period of 24 months into the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1959 to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

Secondly, it extends the so-called doctor's draft law from the present termination date of July 1, 1959 to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

Third, it extends the suspension on strength limitations of the various armed services from July 1, 1959 to July 1, 1963, a period of 4 years.

Fourth, it extends the Dependents Assistance Act from July 1, 1959 to July 1, 1963, a period 4 years. This is the law under which enlisted personnel with dependents receive increased allowances.

Now, I am going to go into detail on all of these laws, but I would like to take them in order.

First, the extension of the draft.

Mr. Chairman, no one in the Congress, I am sure, would favor a draft bill unless it were absolutely necessary. But we all know that we face a serious challenge to our national security. We have got to maintain an armed force in excess of 2½ million men for the foreseeable future. And in order to maintain this force, we have got to have some form of compulsion on the statute books.

Mr. Chairman, we are a peace-loving nation. We are not a nation made up of military-minded people.

As a result, there is a limit to the number of individuals who will volunteer for military service, if all forms of compulsion are removed.

No one likes to vote for a draft law, but we must all measure up to the responsibility imposed upon us by the Constitution and by the American people.

We have no choice but to vote for this bill, in order to maintain our Armed Forces at the strength deemed necessary to assure our continued existence as a free nation.

Now let me tell you something about the history of the draft.

We passed the draft law in 1940 before the outbreak of World War II. That act finally expired, after several extensions, in March of 1947. At that time the Armed Forces were at a strength of approximately 1,380,000.

But the services were having difficulty in maintaining that strength.

In 1948 it became apparent to President Truman that a reenactment of the

Selective Service Act of 1940 would be necessary in order to maintain the strength figures that had been suggested.

At that time the Air Force was short some 25,000 recruits, and the Army was 129,000 below its authorized strength of 669,000.

At the same time the President and the Congress decided that because of world conditions we would have to expand our forces to approximately 2 million.

Now remember this was just before Korea. In other words, we were having trouble maintaining a force of 1,380,000 by voluntary methods and we knew we would need a draft law if we attempted to expand to a force structure of 2 million people.

Today we know that the defense of the country requires a minimum force of 2,525,000 men.

Mr. Chairman, if we were not able to maintain a strength of 1,380,000 in 1948 on a purely voluntary basis; if it took a draft law in 1948 to attempt to reach a larger force structure of 2 million men, it must be perfectly obvious that we cannot attain a force structure of 2½ million on a purely voluntary basis today.

Now since 1948 we have passed many laws to improve the attractiveness of a service career. Our reenlistment rates have increased; our officer retention rates have improved; and the money that has been spent on increased pay and benefits for the armed services has undoubtedly increased the efficiency and stability of our Armed Forces.

But we are still a long way from a purely voluntary force. We still have to fill the gap between the recruit and the trained specialist. Our trained specialists are reenlisting at a better rate. But before these men become specialists they have already spent several years in the Armed Forces.

I mention all of this because I am convinced, as is the Committee on Armed Services, that the only way we can maintain a force structure of 2½ million men in our armed services is to continue the draft law on the books for another 4 years.

Now, let me refresh your memories on how the draft law operates.

Every young man upon attaining the age of 18 must register with his local draft board. He remains liable for induction up to age 26, and if he is deferred for any reason that liability is extended to age 35. Now the committee inserted this extended liability provision in the law in 1951 deliberately. The idea came from the Committee on Armed Services, and not from the Department of Defense. We put this in the law so that men who obtained deferments in essential industry would not do so to escape the draft. These men remain liable up to age 35 and it has had a very salutary effect upon those who might otherwise have sought to obtain deferments merely to escape their military obligation. And, of even greater importance, it stabilized the college deferment program by assuring local boards that college deferments would not open an escape route for some registrants.

Now there are 4,012 local draft boards

throughout the United States and its possessions. There are also 93 appeal boards with extra panels.

And I would like at this time to pay a high tribute to those loyal citizens who serve on the local boards and appeal boards. There are over 38,000 American citizens representing about 90 percent of all selective service personnel who work without pay. As a matter of fact, the Selective Service System only employs about 6,000 full-time and part-time civilians. The entire appropriation for the Selective Service System is only \$27,500,000 annually.

These local boards have the job of registering and classifying these young men.

It is not an easy job, and it is made more complicated, of course, by regulations which change from time to time as conditions change.

These boards must decide who will be drafted and who will be deferred.

We very deliberately placed this responsibility in the hands of the local boards and not in the hands of officials here in Washington. The Congress felt, quite properly, that local boards, who are familiar with local conditions, should make the determination as to who of their neighbors must be drafted.

This is a tremendous job. There are over 20 million registrants in the Selective Service System. Of course, these are the total registrants since 1948. Many of them have already served in the Armed Forces, or many of them are now serving in the Armed Forces, but it is quite a job keeping track of all of these individuals. I think the Selective Service System does a magnificent job and is to be congratulated for the fair and impartial manner in which the System operates.

Now the law, as you know, provides for deferments and it also provides for some limited exemptions. It also provides that no one can be inducted under the age of 19 if there is someone in that local board area who is available and is over the age of 19.

General LeMay, in referring to the effect that the draft law has on voluntary enlistments in the Air Force, said:

The very fact of its existence causes many men, in preference to being drafted, to enlist in the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, or to enter the Air Force Reserve officer training program.

General LeMay also stated that he appeared before the committee to express the unqualified support of the Department of the Air Force for the bill to extend the draft.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Pate, said:

Although the Marine Corps is a volunteer organization, extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is essential to its manpower program.

Vice Admiral Russell, of the Navy, testified:

During the brief period in 1947 and 1948 when there was no draft act in effect there was a very serious drop in the average quality of volunteer enlistees in the Navy, although this was a relatively low input period. I am convinced that without the influence of the induction authority of the Universal

Military Training and Service Act, there would be a definite reduction in the quality of our volunteers.

The Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force all testified that without the draft law they could not obtain the volunteers that are necessary to maintain the strengths and quality of their respective services.

In the next fiscal year, the Navy will attempt to maintain a budgeted strength of 630,000; the Air Force will attempt to maintain a budgeted strength of 845,000; and the Marine Corps will attempt to maintain a budgeted strength of 175,000. We know that they cannot maintain these strengths without the draft law.

The Army will attempt to maintain a strength of 870,000 and they know that they cannot come anywhere near this figure without using inductees.

These are the budgeted strengths for fiscal 1960. This contemplates a force structure in excess of 2,500,000 men. And the only way that it can be attained and maintained at this minimum strength is through the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had a fine hearing on this bill.

I would like now to discuss some of the points that were raised during these weeks' hearings which I am sure are in the minds of many Members.

The first point is why we need a 4-year extension of the induction authority. The question has been raised "why not a 2-year extension, or a 1-year extension, or a 3-year extension? Why do we need a 4-year extension?"

There are many answers to this problem. First of all, if precedent has any significance, I should mention that in 1951 we extended the draft law for a 4-year period to 1955, and in 1955 we extended the draft law for a 4-year period until 1959. The same arguments that existed in 1955 are even more significant today.

We are no closer to a peaceful settlement of world conditions in 1959 than we were in 1955. So if the Congress was justified in its action in 1955, it is even more justified in extending the draft law for a 4-year period in 1959. But let us look beyond that.

What does the 4-year draft extension do?

First. Well, it indicates to the free world and any would-be aggressor, our determined effort to maintain a strong national defense system.

Second. We make clear to the world, and to the American people, the extent to which we assume our responsibility among the free nations of the world.

And of equal importance, the youth of America is not deluded into expecting an early end to the draft. Thus, they will not be seeking temporary deferments with the hope that the draft will expire before their turn is reached. They will be able to plan with more certainty for their schooling. They will have a greater opportunity to choose a time to serve voluntarily.

Third. It permits more orderly administration procedures in all of the services—personnel planning can be made on a 4-year basis. This is of sig-

nificance in procurement programs, training programs, and even in the maintenance and operation of training bases.

In that connection, let me quote a statement made by General Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army, in connection with the necessity for a 4-year draft extension.

General Taylor said:

As I look at the future and consider the manpower requirements of our country, I can't see anything in the international situation that suggests a reduced requirement for manpower below that essentially which we have now.

Furthermore, these studies of our ability to support our Armed Forces by enlistment alone, suggest that about a million and a half men is the maximum. It is inconceivable to me that we could defend our security with any force like a million and a half men in the foreseeable future.

I make the other point, that for stability of our military planning, of our military program, we must be able to project ourselves at least 4 years into the future. A shorter period of time from the point of view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for example, is virtually meaningless. We must have this stability in our planning, which is based in this case upon knowing about what manpower we can count upon.

Finally, I would just say that in the present international climate any reduction of the time of our draft extension would suggest, I am afraid, to our allies, that perhaps we don't think the situation is particularly serious, and I think it would have serious adverse psychological impacts abroad as well as at home.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if General Taylor is equally concerned about the psychology of the people of the United States of America when they learn that the British may abolish their draft altogether in 1960?

Mr. VINSON. There is no evidence in the record. England has a draft for 24 months. Some 15 or 16 NATO countries have drafts for varying periods of time.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the record to show that. Let me read from your own hearings. This is referring to the British:

Current policy contemplates terminating conscription in 1960.

Mr. VINSON. The record shows that in England today the draft is 24 months. That is exactly what the record shows.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What difference does it make what it is today if they are going to abolish it?

Mr. VINSON. There is no statement issued by the British Government. There have been statements in the press, but there is no definite policy. Whether or not England does abandon it, our position in the world today demands that America keep it.

Mr. GROSS. I am interested in the people of this country. I am not interested in extending the draft to please some foreign country.

Mr. VINSON. We are not extending the draft to please some foreign people.

We are extending the draft for the reason that our minimum force structure requires 2,500,000 men. We cannot obtain that number without the draft law, and we are extending it a reasonable length of time so that there can be orderly planning, orderly handling of the manpower, which will all reflect in economy in managing the whole Department of Defense.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. In connection with the statement by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], about Great Britain, I will ask him if he is reading from the hearings, and if he read, "The current policy contemplates termination of conscription in 1960. However, it is understood the British Government has also said some form of conscription would be necessary if voluntary recruitments fail." Has the gentleman read that?

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how you can terminate conscription and still have it?

Mr. KILDAY. I wanted to point out the full statement in the record, that there is a commitment from the British Government that should their reenlistment continue, it would not be necessary.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is some more British doubletalk.

Mr. KILDAY. I am not able to interpret that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that if the British do abolish their draft it is all the more important for us to keep strong?

Mr. VINSON. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts hits the nail exactly on the head.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently there are those who believe we should continue to fight the battles for the British. Sure.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the next question to which I wish to address myself is the time of extension. This will be debated when our distinguished new colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Wolf] offers an amendment. He has advised me he proposes this afternoon to offer an amendment to cut the length of time to 2 years. We will have more to say on that.

From the historical standpoint, we extended the draft in 1951 to 1955; and in 1955 we extended it to 1959. The history of the extension of the draft has been mainly along the line of a 4-year extension. This makes for far better administration. The 38,000 men throughout the country who compose the draft boards, and these boys who are getting deferments—the whole machinery—will have a better climate within which to operate than they would if we merely extend it for 2 years.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. MEYER. The gentleman spoke of history; how about more than 150 years

of history as compared with just the past few years of history?

Mr. VINSON. I can only go back in recent history; I cannot go back 150 years. Let me say, however, that the history of the draft in the United States from 1917, which was the first time the draft was resorted to since Civil War days, has been one of extensions for 4-year periods.

Mr. MEYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is this: In spite of the reductions in our Armed Forces, which will be the subject of future debate on this floor; I am sure, I have seen no evidence submitted by anyone that indicates that our international commitments have lessened, or will lessen in the years ahead.

We know that the cold war will continue. We know that there will probably be future Lebanons, and future Formosas. And it just is not fair to hold out a hope for the elimination of the draft over the next 4 years.

But if our voluntary enlistment rates by some miracle do reach a point where we no longer need the draft law, then the Congress will be here to terminate the induction authority, if that becomes necessary.

Now do not think for a moment that the Army is the only service that needs a draft law. The draft law is just as important and probably more so to the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force. And do not think for a moment that the Army itself would not like to terminate the draft if they could. The Army would like to be a purely voluntary force and not have the constant problem of retraining personnel facing them all the time.

The Army would prefer volunteers. But when they cannot get all volunteers they have to get some inductees. But those inductees make good soldiers. And they do give the Army something which is irreplaceable in a national defense system—a variety of skills. They only get these people for 2 years, but then they have a reserve obligation for a short period thereafter. The Army gets college graduates as well as high school graduates; they get physicists, chemists, engineers, just as they get young graduates from high schools.

They get a cross section of America through the draft law which enhances our national security.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to the question of the draft age.

Today men are liable for induction between the ages of 18½ and 26, and those who have been deferred remain liable up to age 35.

The average age of involuntary induction today is 22½ years and this will increase to about 23 years during the next 4 years.

Now immediately some will say that we should be drafting younger men.

First of all, let me tell you that 50 percent of the inductees who enter the Army today do so on a voluntary basis. They can volunteer for induction at the age of 17 with their parents' consent, and at 18 without parental consent. Many thousands of young men enter the service in this manner.

These men volunteer for induction for a 2-year period either before or after they have completed their formal education. They choose the time when they want to fulfill their military obligation.

Others wait until they complete their education before entering the service and some of these are involuntarily inducted. Obviously, these men are going to be older since they have gone to college.

Some of these may be approaching the age of 26. Some of them are in their 25th or 24th year. But all of these young men have had an opportunity to volunteer for induction.

They have all had an opportunity to volunteer for the other services for a longer time if they so desired.

If we lower the draft age, by law, from 26 to a lower age, we may seriously disrupt college deferment programs, and it is possible, depending upon the future size of the Armed Forces, that we may have to induct fathers.

Today we do not induct fathers. I think we all agree that this is a good policy. The impact upon the community is much greater when a father is inducted than when a nonfather is inducted. By inducting nonfathers we lessen hardship throughout the Nation.

If we lower the draft age by law, then local boards, in an effort to keep men from escaping all military service, will certainly cease to be liberal with their present deferment policies. Now I mention this because there has been a great deal of discussion about the draft age.

I think I should tell you that the law itself permits the President, when he sees fit, to draft by age group or age groups.

In other words, the President could decide tomorrow to induct only those who are in the 21st- or 22d-year age group. Or he could induct those who are in the 19-year age group.

But here we are dealing with statistics and the so-called manpower pool.

I think you will be interested to know that on November 30, 1958, of all those who were then 26 years of age and who were registrants under the draft law, 9 out of 10 qualified registrants had fulfilled their military obligation or were in the process of fulfilling their military obligation. Now, of course, those are qualified registrants.

Of the total registrants on November 30, 1958, who were 26 years of age, including those not qualified, 7 out of 10 had fulfilled their military obligation, or were in the process of fulfilling their military obligation.

This is very significant to keep in mind. You have heard a lot of talk about the chances of being drafted are about 1 in 10.

That does not tell the story. We take in approximately 500,000 men a year into our armed services. They go in as voluntary recruits, as inductees, or as 6 months' trainees. And it is perfectly obvious that the total number of individuals inducted only represents about 20 percent of the total number of men entering our armed services.

But do not overlook the fact that all these come out of the same and only manpower pool.

Now the reason why we have more registrants than qualified registrants is also obvious.

Under existing physical and mental standards, which were raised last year by an act of Congress, 33 percent of all registrants are classified as IV-F.

That is, 33 percent of all registrants are physically, mentally, or morally disqualified for service in our Armed Forces.

To this must be added those who are deferred for hardship reasons because they are supporting families or for other hardship reasons. Then there is a small group of individuals who are deferred because their work involves national security.

But I repeat, on November 30, 1958, 9 out of 10 of the qualified registrants under the Universal Military Training and Service Act had completed their military obligation or were in the process of completing their military obligation.

Last year, as I mentioned, we gave the President the authority to increase the mental and physical standards for induction into the Armed Forces. This has greatly improved the efficiency of the Army and as a result, three out of five Army disciplinary barracks have been closed.

Certainly, this action on the part of the Congress increased the IV-F deferment rate, but on the other hand, it drastically reduced the number of men who were confined to disciplinary barracks in the Army or who were discharged after short periods of time because they were found unqualified for military service.

After all, we are concerned about the security of this country and we are concerned about the quality of the men in whom we place this great responsibility. Those men must be physically and mentally qualified to perform their duties. That is the reason we gave the President the authority to raise the physical and mental standards last year.

Now, the second objective of the bill is the extension of the so-called doctor's draft law.

Now, just what is the doctor's draft law?

Well, as you know, we defer students to go to college.

Medical and dental students require longer deferments because their training takes a longer period of time.

As I previously stated, the law says that anybody deferred for any reason remains liable up to age 35.

Now, these doctors and dentists who have been deferred to complete medical or dental school incur a draft liability up to age 35.

The law also gives the President the authority to make special calls from among those who are in medical or dental categories.

As a result, these people are liable for induction, but actually they aren't being inducted because we give them an opportunity to apply for a Reserve commission and then they are ordered to active duty for 24 months.

They come on active duty as Reserve captains in the Army and the Air Force, or as lieutenants in the Navy, and they also qualify for special pay.

Now, how many of these doctors do we have on active duty?

As of November 30, 1958, the Army had 1,629 Regular officers who were physicians, and 2,198 physicians who were Reserve officers. Of these 2,198 Reserve officer physicians, 1,579 entered the Army as a result of the doctor's draft law. They weren't drafted, but they entered as Reserve officers because of the doctor's draft law.

In the Navy, as of November 30, 1958, there were 1,626 Regular officer physicians and 1,672 Reserve officer physicians. Of this number, 1,186 Reserve officer physicians entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law.

In the Air Force, there were 1,144 Regular officer physicians and 2,274 Reserve officer physicians. Of these 2,274 Reserve officer physicians, 1,700 entered the Air Force as a result of the doctors' draft law.

The average annual rate of physicians on active duty to total personnel is 3.4 physicians per thousand troop strength. This strength figure varies throughout the year, but the overall average is 3.4.

All told, as of November 30, 1958, there were 10,543 physicians on active duty in the Armed Forces.

Now let us look at the dentists for a moment.

In the Army there were 529 Regular dental officers, and 1,250 Reserve dental officers. Of these 1,250 Reserve dental officers, 1,012 entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law.

In the Air Force there were 441 Regular dental officers and 1,336 Reserve dental officers and of these 1,336 Reserve dental officers, 996 entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law. The average strength of dentists is two per thousand troop strength.

In the Navy there were 1,012 Regular dental officers, and 587 Reserve dental officers. Of these 587 Reserve dental officers, 513 entered on active duty as a result of the doctors' draft law.

All told, there were 5,155 dentists on active duty on November 30, 1958.

I believe it is important to note that all of the Reserve officers on active duty as a result of the doctors draft law entered on active duty prior to age 35. In addition, all of these doctors were at one time deferred to complete their education.

I think from these figures it is perfectly obvious that we would not be able to provide adequate medical and dental care for members of our Armed Forces if we did not have the doctors draft law in operation.

Now, the mothers and fathers of this Nation have a right to expect that their sons, when called into the military service, will receive the finest medical and dental treatment possible. And this is also true of the wives and children of these men who are serving our country. If we did not have the doctors draft law, we just would not be able to furnish this medical care.

Now let me discuss the third objective of the bill—the suspension of strength limitations.

Permanent law imposes a strength limitation on the size of the Army of

837,000 persons. And yet the budgeted strength for fiscal 1960 is 870,000. Permanent law imposes a maximum limitation on the size of the Air Force of 502,000, but the budgeted strength for fiscal 1960 is 845,000.

Now these limitations on the size of the Army and the Air Force, together with a lesser limitation on the size of the Navy, have been suspended by separate law until July 1, 1959. Thus, the third objective of the proposed legislation is to extend this suspension to July 1, 1963.

I think you could see what would happen if we did not extend this provision of law. The Air Force would drop from 845,000 to 502,000—a loss of 343,000 men; the Army strength would drop from 870,000 to 837,000, a loss of 33,000 men; and the Navy would lose about 4,000 regular Navy enlisted personnel.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the fourth objective of the proposed legislation—the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act—the law under which enlisted personnel draw increased allowances because of their dependents.

Under this law, enlisted personnel draw allowances ranging from \$51.30 per month to \$96.90 per month, depending upon their grade and the number of their dependents. This law is scheduled to expire on July 1, 1959, and if it is not extended, thousands and thousands of enlisted personnel would suffer pay cuts ranging from 25 percent to 50 percent of their pay.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have discussed with the membership the four objectives of the proposed legislation.

First. The extension of the regular draft law for 4 years.

Second. The extension of the doctors draft law for 4 years.

Third. The extension of the suspension on the limitation on the size of the Armed Forces for 4 years.

Fourth. The extension of the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years.

These laws are all vital for our national security.

Each and everyone of them is an indispensable part of our defense program.

We, in the Congress, have the responsibility for raising and supporting armies and maintaining a navy. That responsibility is imposed by the Constitution of the United States. Enacting this bill represents the fulfillment of this responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, enacting this bill is also America's answer to the challenge of any would-be aggressor.

This is our reply to those who might think we are beginning to weaken internally.

This is our reply to those who feel that the American people will not face up to reality.

This, Mr. Chairman, is America's promise to the world that we will remain strong and that the young men of our Nation will continue to be trained and ready for a day, which we hope will never come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who is one of the great Americans of all time—and I say that not flatteringly but in the most complimentary and sincere manner—has made a speech which certainly commands the attention of all of us, particularly those of us charged with responsibility as we are as Members of the Congress. The gentleman particularly referred to the fact that the main fight here might be on reducing the time to 2 years. If that amendment were adopted it would be construed abroad as a sign of weakness on our part. I hope the bill will not be amended in that fashion. I respect those who believe in that. Of course, they believe in the strength of America just as much as we do, and my remarks are not to be construed either directly or indirectly as any reflection upon those who think that way. However, if we are going to err we better err on the side of strength rather than on the side of a weakness.

When Mr. Mikoyan was over here he felt that with a Republican President and a Democratic Congress there would be a division, but he failed to recognize constitutional government and, over and above it all, we are Americans.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his contribution. He is absolutely right. If it were flashed out to the world today that the House of Representatives had reduced the draft down to 2 years, in every chancery in the world it would be said that America has changed her policies, no longer is she going to be strong, no longer is she going to be the leading nation of the world for the free people and to maintain our liberties and our American way of life. We must not let this matter be eroded here by 2 years or any other period of time less than 4 year. It is absolutely essential for orderly administration to have the 4-year term.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this a draft bill governing American forces or is it a draft bill to please foreigners? I would like to get that straightened out.

Mr. ARENDS. It is a draft bill governing only Americans, but we cannot get away from the fact that we are the No. 1 nation of the world today and what we here do reflects itself upon all the other nations of the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The leadership of every country in the world is charged with the primary duty of doing those things, particularly in a crisis, that are for the national interest of that country, whether it be the United States, little Liberia or any other country. Without regard to what any other country might do, we are charged with taking a course of action that is in the national interest of our own country. I think this bill is decidedly in the national interest of our

country. We are charged with our job here in America.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I might suggest to the gentleman that if these countries are so interested in maintaining military forces, they first extend the obligated service of their own draftees. Very few have the obligated service that is required of conscripts in this country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, there is little that I can add to the detailed explanation that has just been presented by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON.

He has given you a complete and thorough explanation of the need for this legislation and has fully justified every aspect of the bill.

I might add, parenthetically, that the Congress of the United States and the American people are fortunate indeed to have a man of Mr. VINSON's outstanding ability serving in the Congress of the United States and occupying the very responsible position that he does as Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. Mr. VINSON is one of the few Members of Congress who was in this room when the Draft Act was passed in 1917.

As the distinguished chairman has stated, no one likes to vote for a draft law, but nevertheless we all have a responsibility and that responsibility must be met regardless of our personal desires and wishes.

We all devoutly hope for peace, but I know and you know, that peace today is not based upon hopes for mutual understanding and good will, but is based upon our ability to defeat, by force of arms, any would-be aggressor.

As much as we may hope and pray for peaceful solutions to all international problems, we all know that those problems will not be solved in the immediate future by embarking on a course of military weakness. In other words, much as we might desire, this whole matter will not just go away.

The proposed legislation, H.R. 2260, is the basic law under which we maintain the strength of our Armed Forces. It is an indispensable part of our manpower personnel program. Without it we know we cannot maintain the strengths necessary for our security. If we were not drafting a single man, this law would still be necessary as a stimulant for voluntary enlistments.

In many ways, the draft law is a tribute to the Christian principles of our people. We do not want war and our national heritage is based upon the principles of the freedom of man. Our young men are not military minded. As a result they do not volunteer in large numbers to become a part of a military system.

But they do recognize their obligation to the Nation and the necessity for maintaining our military strengths. So long as there is a draft law on the statute books, these young men will fulfill their obligation willingly, and conscientiously. But remove this law from the statute books, and we will give these young men a false impression of the gravity of the world situation.

The distinguished chairman from Georgia has discussed with the membership why we must extend this law for 4 years. He has discussed with you the induction age and many other subjects that were thoroughly studied during the hearings.

As a result, the Committee on Armed Services recommends to the membership of this House the enactment of the proposed legislation with one technical amendment.

We might just as well face the facts of life and not attempt to delude the American people into a false sense of complacency with regard to the length of time that this law must remain in operation.

A 4-year extension of this law is necessary not only because of its effect upon the free nations of the world; not only because of its effect upon the career planning of our young men; not only because it enhances personnel planning in the Department of Defense; not only because it enhances procurement programs; but most important of all, because it demonstrates to the Soviet Union that we intend to remain strong in every military aspect.

Now Mr. Chairman, because the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has explained the functions of the draft law so well, I thought I would spend just a few moments to discuss with the membership the Doctors Draft Law.

Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, authority is provided for the Secretary of Defense to issue separate calls for men qualified as physicians and dentists. H.R. 2260, as amended, will extend this authority until July 1, 1953.

There is no question about the need to provide proper medical care for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

The simple facts are that too few physicians and dentists choose a career in the Armed Forces to provide the minimum numbers of these specialists required for our 2½ million-man force, and their dependents scattered about the world.

In recent years, more physicians and dentists have entered the regular services. The Armed Forces estimate that by June 30, 1959, about 50 percent of all physicians and about 40 percent of all dentists serving on active duty, will be career officers. But these are far too few. The services must rely for the balance of their needs on men required to perform 24 months of active duty under the draft law. Without compulsion, the services would be unable to attract even half the number of physicians and dentists they require.

Under present legislation, and under the proposed extension, the President has authority to order physicians and dentists from the Reserve to active duty for a period of 2 years. So long as enough of these specialists apply and are commissioned in the Reserve, the authority to order them for induction need not be used. But the authority to induct them is vital to induce them to apply for Reserve commissions. Then, when needed, physicians and dentists can be called to serve on active duty.

This authority to induct doctors has kept the services supplied with vitally needed medical and dental personnel.

The effect of the law has been to induce draft-liable physicians and dentists to seek Reserve commissions and enter on active duty as needed. As an added inducement, extra pay of \$100 per month is provided for those physicians and dentists.

When we began to mobilize for the Korean war, the need for physicians and dentists was obvious. The first doctor draft law imposed the liability for service on physicians and dentists up to the age of 51. Priorities of liability were established based on the amount of prior service and whether a man had been deferred to study for these professions, or had received help from the Government to obtain schooling through service-sponsored World War II specialist training programs.

Those first to be called were physicians and dentists who had been deferred or had received their professional education at Government expense, and had served less than 90 days in the armed services. Priority II included those physicians and dentists who had been deferred or received help and who had served less than 21 months. Priority III were those without service after 1940; and priority IV were those with service who had not reached their 51st birthday, and were not in priorities I or II.

A nationwide system of advisory committees was created to advise local boards on community needs for physicians and dentists. This was necessary to provide for civilian needs, while meeting military requirements.

This effective and equitable way of supplying physicians and dentists and allied specialists to the armed services was extended for 2 more years in 1953.

There were some changes in the types of prior service recognized as affecting liability under the act, and some modification of the length of service required, also based on the amount of prior service. In general, the obligations on physicians and dentists were lightened by the 1953 amendments.

In 1954, provision was made for the utilization of these professional men in an enlisted status in cases where they either could not or would not serve as officers. Only 65 were inducted out of 12,000 requisitioned by the Department of Defense up to June 30, 1954.

In 1955, the authority to draft physicians and dentists was extended for 2 more years to July 1, 1957, but the upper age of liability was reduced to 46.

Then in 1957, the special priorities and age provisions of the former doctor draft legislation were dropped. Under the 1957 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, physicians, dentists, and allied specialists were made liable under the act as regular registrants and on the same terms as other registrants are liable, with two exceptions. Those exceptions are:

First. That the Department of Defense retained authority to issue separate calls for physicians and dentists.

Second. The President retained the authority to order medical and dental

Reserve officers to active duty for 24 months without their consent.

Physicians and dentists are subject to the same ages of liability as are other registrants. And, like other registrants, deferments before age 26 for study, for occupational and other reasons, extend liability to age 35.

By virtue of this extension of liability provision of the act, practically all physicians and dentists acquire liability to age 35.

It is practically impossible for a man to complete his medical or dental study and training without a deferment. In the normal course of events a man is reached for induction before his 23d birthday. If he is not to be inducted, he must be deferred.

More than 12,000 physicians and 5,000 dentists have been requisitioned by the armed services. Only 83 have been inducted. In addition, more than 3,600 physicians are at present receiving additional training under the Armed Forces Reserve medical officer commissioning and residency consideration plan. The program is designed to give the services physicians with training in special fields. Early in 1955, the Director of Selective Service and the Department of Defense agreed to the program whereby a limited number of registrants who became Reserve officers are permitted to complete residency training before being called to active duty.

The Director of Selective Service recommends deferment of men selected by the Department of Defense for training under this program. It is a source of physicians with training in specialized fields and accounts for a large portion of the physicians required for active duty tours.

This program is being continued.

As mentioned above, while thousands of physicians and dentists have entered the Armed Forces under the stimulus of the doctor draft and the Universal Military Training and Service Act, only 83 have actually been inducted. This is a tribute to the success of the entire program.

Under H.R. 2260, as under present law, no doctor will be inducted if he applies for a Reserve commission and is rejected solely on the grounds of physical disqualification.

Such doctors who are members of Reserve components, and who are under 35, and have not performed at least 12 months of active duty, may be ordered to active duty for not more than 24 months.

Physicians or dentists who serve on active duty for 12 months or more as reservists shall upon release or within 6 months have an opportunity to resign the commission, unless they are otherwise obligated.

A physician or dentist qualified for a reserve commission has a right to volunteer for active duty for 24 months so long as his service is needed.

Provision is made for appointment or promotion to a rank commensurate with experience and qualifications. Most doctors enter on active duty as captains in the Army and Air Force, or as lieutenants in the Navy.

The Armed Forces have not found it necessary to requisition physicians or dentists since February 1957. However, it is significant that with July 1, 1959, the expiration date of the doctor draft approaching, a decline has occurred in the numbers applying through the residency program or otherwise for Reserve commissions. There was some indication late last year than an induction call might have to be issued. In anticipation, the local boards had to order physicians for physical examination in order to be prepared to meet a possible call. But the ordering of physical examinations was enough. It prompted a renewal of applications for commissions and residency training sufficient to insure a continual supply of physicians at least until July 1, 1959.

This one recent example of how the doctor draft works is alone proof of its essentiality. And it is a strong argument, too, for a 4-year extension. No matter how obvious the need may be to continue the doctor draft, the very fact of its approaching expiration date has misled some doctors and dentists into a false belief that they will not be needed.

A survey conducted by the Council on National Defense of the American Medical Association covering the period January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, the latest available figures, indicates that more than 77 percent of physicians who had served on active duty and were separated from active duty during this period were satisfied with their assignments insofar as they pertained to their training and experience.

And as a final tribute to the administration of this essential law, I would like to mention that no physicians or dentists were inducted in fiscal 1958, and none have been inducted to date in fiscal 1959.

The law, in my opinion, is working satisfactorily and should be extended.

It is the only method by which we can assure the men in our services, and their families, as well as the mothers and fathers of young men being inducted, that adequate medical and dental care will be available for these people.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the enactment of the proposed legislation as essential to the welfare and security of our Nation. We must extend the draft; we have no choice.

It interrupts medical and dental manpower planning and programs. A 4-year extension will leave no doubt in the minds of our young professional men that for most of them their careers must include 2 years in the armed services.

Now, before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell you what our replacement requirements for physicians in the Military Establishment will be over the next 4 years.

In fiscal 1960, we will need 1,950.

In fiscal 1961, we will need 1,400.

In fiscal 1962, we will need 1,900.

In fiscal 1963, we will need 1,375.

In that connection, I want to compliment the Department of Defense for the manner in which it has kept the ratio of physicians to troop strengths at a reasonable level.

In 1947, there was 6.6 physicians per thousand troop strength.

In 1948, there was 5.4 per thousand troop strength.

Since that time, the Department of Defense has made strenuous efforts to reduce this ratio, which is now 3.4 per thousand troop strength.

Not long ago there was some opposition on the part of the physicians to the fact that too much time was spent in nonprofessional duties which interfered with the practice of medicine.

This objection has now been overcome and it is interesting to note that only 2 percent of our physicians on active duty are engaged in staff or administrative duties, 11 percent are engaged in research, training overhead, in a travel status, or ill; 87 percent of all physicians on active duty are engaged in professional medical care.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I, too, would like to commend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and also our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. I have heard the conclusion uttered twice that a 2-year extension might reflect our weakness throughout the world. Has the gentleman given any thought to the fact that extending the law for 2 years with a provision for review might, on the contrary, reflect confidence in our strength and security rather than weakness, and might also result in lessening the tensions created by the cold war?

Mr. ARENDS. I feel we have done exactly that in the action taken by our committee. From time to time we review this question. I have no quarrel with what the gentleman is thinking about. But in view of the danger presently facing us, and from the standpoint of planning in the Department of Defense for our manpower needs, I think we are best off in another extension for 4 years, as is provided in the bill before us.

Let me simply mention this in passing, that in the matter of procurement of doctors and dentists we have brought about more efficiency in the services, where today we find the need for doctors and dentists has been brought down to 3.4 per thousand troops. In other words, more efficiency is being gained today in the medical activities of the doctors and dentists in service than ever before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am still not satisfied with the answer I have received with respect to satisfying foreigners. Were any representatives of foreign governments before the committee?

Mr. ARENDS. No; they were not.

Mr. GROSS. Are they going to be satisfied with 4 years?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, let us satisfy ourselves.

Mr. GROSS. I just thought maybe we could extend it for 8 or 10 years and then the lights would not go out in the chancelleries of foreign governments.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to my friend from Iowa that I tried to pinpoint that a moment ago—that we are not thinking in terms of compulsory military training solely for the people of this country, but at the present time due to the situation we face in a troubled and disturbed world, and the fact that we are spending untold billions of dollars, which every Member of this House will vote for, then why not put a weak link in this whole chain which might weaken the defense of this country.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, may I say I feel very strongly about my position on the 2-year extension as opposed to the 4-year extension.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like publicly to thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] for his many courtesies and kindnesses to me during the last few days. I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues the inscription engraved in the walls of this Chamber above the Speaker's rostrum. If you will read these words of Daniel Webster and keep them in mind, I would like to read my statement.

I want to make it clear as I begin that I do not question whether at this time we need the draft. Rather, I agree that right now we need the draft because we have no prepared alternatives to offer in its place. But I do not accept the theory that we will never have an alternative to the draft. It is my firm belief that if we work diligently at this problem, before the end of this 2-year period we will have arrived at a solution in which we can maintain the needed rate of enlistment without the necessity of peacetime military conscription. Furthermore, my position is based on the necessity of strengthening our national military posture, because I do not believe that we are getting the kind of men necessary to run the military equipment we are spending billions to get.

Hence, any arguments I make must be considered within this frame of reference: Do our military manpower policies give us greater security or not? The administration's position on the question of an automatic 4-year extension of the draft has been put well by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve Finucane, who stated on page 35 of the committee hearings to the question presented by a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I quote: "Why not a longer period of time or a lesser period of time?" To this, Secretary Finucane said, and I quote: "I think your question is a good one, sir, historically the draft has in the wisdom of Congress been extended

for 4 years and we would like simply for conformity's sake to carry on with the habits of the past."

Mr. Chairman, the administration's position forces every Member of this Congress to ask himself another question: Is conforming to the habits of the past going to give us adequate national security in the space age? I submit to you, gentlemen, that this is exactly what an automatic 4-year extension does. Why should we have a 4-year extension? Do we fear to face up to fundamental weaknesses in our present military system? We must ask ourselves if in the space age when the Soviet Bear is grinning and laughing at our faltering and futile gestures we are content for conformity's sake to carry on with the habits of the past. Are we so tired as as a people, are we so timid as legislators that we are willing to drift with the errors, inequities and false security given to us by our Selective Service System? I do not think the American people want to drift. I am sure that they want not the questionable habits of the past—not conformity—but deliberation and decisive action. It is within this context that we must ask ourselves what we are going to do about the draft extension.

Before I go on, let me reiterate that at this time I am for a 2-year extension of the draft. If a 2-year extension is voted down—I will vote for a 4-year extension rather than none at all, but with a heavy heart. I am voting for an extension not because I believe that the draft is a panacea but because we do not have any effective alternatives ready to use in place of the draft. It is my feeling that this is because we have been taking too lightly our obligation of reviewing in a comprehensive fashion the function and consequences of our military manpower policies. The extension of the draft for a full 4 years is an easy way out. It is a way whereby Congress is able to pass off its solemn obligation for another 4 years to consider the problems of the draft. If, on the other hand, the draft is only renewed for 2 years, Congress is obligated to consider the problem of the selective service within the next 2 years. A joint committee or a committee of the Armed Services Committee is obligated to return to this Congress with a report that will either give us alternatives or change the existing system. Gentlemen, the 4-year draft, I fear, is a continuation of the policy of having quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security; it is a continuation of a drifting, shifting somnambulance which America can no longer afford.

Let me point out some of the serious and complex problems which our selective service and Reserve policies have either caused or not resolved. At the present time the Federal Government spends as much as \$14,000 for the training of each draftee. Only 3 out of every 100 draftees reenlist after their 2-year term ends. The present high turnover of military personnel who are drafted con-

stitute a great waste of the taxpayers' money, adds to our mounting cost of national defense and exerts an inflationary pressure on our national economy. More important, just as these men become trained and may be of some use to the armed services they leave after their 2-year training period. Liddell Hart, the British strategist and military historian has pointed out that the cost of training conscripts and other costs caused by the rapid turnover of short-term soldiers are not exceeded by gains in military power and military security. He states:

Conscripts cannot be trained in 18 months or 2 years to the high grade of skill required for modern warfare, for by the time they are trained to even an employment level so little of their period of service remains that their employment is bad economy.

We are all aware of the fact that present military strategy demands not masses of men who are ill-trained, but manageable groups of men well-trained in the tactics of modern warfare, the techniques of tactical nuclear warfare, the use of newly developed complex weapons and weapon systems. We do not have this when we have a large pool of men in the armed services who are biding their time until they leave the services. It should also be pointed out that it is not only the draftee who spends his time doing tasks that could be performed by civilians. Let me state in passing that this system is being used by the Air Force. They have been able to replace 43,000 airmen with 31,000 civilians in one noncombat area. The Regulars also become involved in this syndrome of wasteful activity. A large proportion of them become absorbed in the training machine for conscripts, and in caretaker jobs at home and overseas. Do any of us here honestly believe that the 6-month active duty training program or the Air Force 10-week training program or even the 2-year military conscription program gives an enlisted man enough opportunity and training in the use of nuclear weapons so that he would be combat ready in even a limited war with these weapons?

We all recognize that during other great national emergencies democratic standards and ideals have had to be protected through the use of military conscription. This was accepted by our citizens during the Second World War because of the immediate necessity for mass armies and because conscription was universally applied. But now there is serious question as to the need for mass armies and further, under the present Selective Service System, more than one-half of the men in the eligible age group have a combination of circumstances and means, including deferment, been excused from any form of military service. A large part of the burden of conscription has fallen unfairly upon youths who for economic reasons are unable to obtain draft deferment. These men cannot afford to attend college or must postpone marriage and the raising of a family.

According to John Graham, in a study prepared for the Fund for the Republic, there are as many as 60 ways for a young man to fulfill his military obligation without actually serving time in the draft. For example, in early 1957, the pool of draft-age men was about 5 million, of whom 2.3 million were fathers who consequently are indefinitely deferred under draft regulations. Conscientious objectors are deferred; many professional athletes will disqualify because of so-called physical handicaps; college students are deferred; scientists for the most part are deferred. By Executive order set forth in January 1956, men past 26 years of age are dropped to the bottom of the draft list. This has the effect of releasing these men from their military obligation. I am not arguing that these men should not be deferred. However, it is clear that the so-called universality of the system is nonexistent. Married students in college often have children to avoid going into the draft. Those who are unable to avoid the draft because of economic or social circumstances are the ones who must enter the army at pay rates much lower than those prevailing in civilian life, thereby adding to their low economic status. Prof. John Galbraith, of Harvard, has asserted that "the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer who benefits by lower taxes to the impecunious young draftee." We are willing to have quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security. As Mr. Cordiner has pointed out in his now famous report:

The modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able at present and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force.

As Gen. Harold Maddux, who directs the Defense Department's manpower requirements said in May 1958:

We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will.

We should not forget the harmful social costs which result from a draft which is universal in name but not in its functions. The draft is affecting adversely the lives of millions of young men and women who are facing the choice of further education, jobs, and marriage. John Graham has pointed out:

Uncertainties about the draft make it impossible for young men to plan ahead and as a result discourage them from getting the advanced training in the sciences or the professions which the country is needing increasingly.

The feeling of loss, insecurity, and uselessness is compounded for thousands and thousands of young men who are already caught up with the bewildering and perplexing problems of adolescence and young adulthood.

In brief then, we are able to see military, economic, and political reasons for extending the draft for only 2 years until that time when we will have more effective alternatives than the draft system.

If I may in my remaining few minutes, I would like to answer certain important questions which may be asked of me. Some of you may ask, if we extend the draft for 2 years only there will be men who will not enlist in the service or the reserve programs, whereas if we extend the draft for 4 years these men will take seriously our intentions of continuing the draft. To this I answer: The armed services may always draft more men during this 2 year period if enlistments are falling behind. Furthermore, at the end of the 2-year period we hope that effective alternatives to the present system will exist so that those who do not have the ability or the will to serve will not have to serve. If, on the other hand, it appears after careful study that there are no other alternatives, Congress may continue the draft for another 4 years, and I shall certainly support this.

It is clear that the Armed Services Committee and the Rules Committee acted with great speed to bring before this Congress a bill for a blanket extension. If the study suggests that a draft is the only answer to our military manpower problems, the Armed Services Committee and the Rules Committee will not be derelict in asking for an extension. Some of you may suggest that the Administration needs a 4-year extension in order to be able to plan rationally its manpower program. To this I would like to answer in Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Mr. Finucane's, terms:

Historically the draft has in the wisdom of Congress been extended for 4 years, and we would like simply for conformity's sake to carry on with the habits of the past.

From this statement it is clear that planning does not demand 4 years. Only conformity demands 4 years.

Some of you ask that the Cordiner report does many of the things that I suggest but we still need the draft. I suggest that the Cordiner report deals only with reenlistment not in attracting men into the services on the lowest level. Increases were percentagewise, which means that privates were only given \$3 a month increase but generals were given as much as \$70 a month increases.

Some of you may ask: Is not the draft needed to secure the services of the necessary unskilled manpower? Sufficient pay would attract such unskilled men as must be in uniform. It is foolish to waste skilled men by drafting them to do unskilled work. By rejecting those men in category IV, we are left with a body of men with a higher level of skill to do this unskilled work. It is a source of discontent to those

skilled men who are drafted and assigned to tasks which do not utilize their capabilities. This is also a waste of the trained men who could be useful to the community in other activity or who might volunteer for more highly skilled work for a sustained period of time if offered better pay by the services. Impressed labor has not always turned out to be cheapest in the long run.

You may also ask: We tried in 1948 to get 2 million men on a voluntary basis and could not—how can we now hope to get 2½ million voluntarily? At that time, there were no programs of incentives to attract and retain manpower. Even so, reenlistments were 65 percent then—presumably because the choice of entering the service in the first place was purely voluntary, and not motivated at least in part by desire to avoid the draft, as now it is—and are only 8 percent now. The drop is presumably due to the fact that many enlist to avoid the draft, and are therefore anxious to serve as briefly as possible. So the draft has actually been accompanied by a decrease in the reenlistment rate. This adds to the amount of training which is wasted on men who leave the service before they have served long enough to justify the amounts spent to train them.

Let us accept the draft as necessary at this time, but I think it is of paramount importance to know what the draft is and what its weaknesses are. I believe that there is enough weakness to show that the draft should be continued for only 2 years while some committee of Congress studies the military system and its manpower procurement policies. This is the only way we will discharge our obligation to ourselves and the American people—this is the only way that we may feel secure in the space age.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to have the gentleman repeat the percentage of enlistments that he just mentioned. I believe he said something in the neighborhood of 8 percent.

Mr. WOLF. In the services other than the Army, the reenlistment rate in 1957 was about 8 percent; approximately.

Mr. KILDAY. In 1957, in the services other than the Army?

Mr. WOLF. According to the figures I was given by the Library of Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. May I ask the gentleman the source of the figure?

Mr. WOLF. The Library of Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. Has the gentleman consulted the hearings as to what percentage is given?

Mr. WOLF. I did, and I was surprised that there was quite a difference, and I hope somebody will clear this difference up for my benefit.

Mr. KILDAY. So you are citing the figures that you received from the Library of Congress?

Mr. WOLF. And the figures from the Library of Congress were based on military figures that they received from the military department.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, on page 38 of the hearings will be found the various percentages by services and by the Department of Defense as a whole for 1957, 1958, and 4 months of 1959.

Mr. WOLF. There seems to be some dispute about those figures. I think there is room for reasonable dispute.

Mr. KILDAY. As to the figures of the Department of Defense, the gentleman feels that there is room for doubting these figures that were given to the committee?

Mr. WOLF. I think that is correct. However, I shall be happy to recheck the figures and discuss it further later today.

Mr. KILDAY. That is all.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa who preceded me that those who advocate a 2-year extension of the draft rather than a 4-year extension seem to indicate that the Congress would be helpless to stop inductions in less than 4 years if we grant a 4-year extension of the draft.

Quite the contrary is true. We can stop inductions at any time sooner than 4 years that the Congress desires—either by repeal of the authority to draft or denial of funds to pay draftees.

But, the best military judgment available in America today has informed the House Committee on Armed Services, which is headed by the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, that we have a military requirement to extend the draft for 4 years. In the first instance, this is for the defense of America, and I, for one, shall accept the judgment of our military leaders, whose devotion to our Nation is no less than our own. And I shall accept the judgment of our distinguished and able chairman, Mr. VINSON, whose years of experience eminently qualify him to make such a recommendation as he has made to us here today—that this legislation be extended for a period of 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the discussion by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I heard him say in the course of his remarks that there could be no argument against the logic which his testimony before this House contained. It was essentially the same testimony with which he opened the hearings and essentially the same testimony which we find in the report.

I learned years ago, Mr. Chairman, that one should rarely quarrel with the logic of one's adversary. Usually the gentleman is learned and his logic is impeccable, and I do not quarrel with the logic. I found instead that typically if one wishes to make a case, one must

first examine the premises upon which the argument proceeds. So if I may use my time today to do so, I should like to examine the premises upon which this controversy, in my opinion, appears to be based. I think our arguments will be found to lie at the heart of the premises upon which the two cases, for a four-year extension and against it, rest.

We can agree, certainly, on the first premise, that we all share an obligation, having taken the oath of office, to provide for the common defense. I am glad that it has been granted here in advance, that this will not be an issue in this debate, that we can agree with that first premise.

We have been given the premise that the draft is the way by which we will secure the strength of the United States and preserve, apparently, the United Nations as well. It is evident from the argument which is made by my distinguished colleague from Iowa that there are those who would argue that the draft is not the way by which we can best secure that strength, for many reasons which he cited.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read parts of a carbon copy I have received of a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services from one William Robert Miller. He says that he was mustered out as a disabled veteran in 1947, after serving with the Far Eastern Air Force in the Philippines. Also, he says, the tradition of volunteering in his family goes back at least to the Civil War and probably to the Revolutionary War.

Then he says:

I am convinced that conscription results in a waste of manpower and money. I am not an expert and have conducted no surveys, but I believe from my experience that from a thoroughly military standpoint alone it could be shown that it is extremely wasteful to build a nation's defenses around men whose first and paramount thought about military service is how to get out of it.

If a man is induced to do a job, he'll work well at it. But we all know how costly forced labor is, and all the patriotic appeals in the world will not put forced labor on a par with the work of freemen. During World War II this fact was borne out in my own experience time and again in the grueling and goldbricking and general malingering of the draftees I saw. I doubt that "goofing off" would be a feature of a regular army of volunteers.

And how is it with officers who have to assign men to various jobs? When they are dealing with draftees, it doesn't seem to make much difference whether the right man goes into the right place. In my time, it seemed to be "standard operational procedure" to put a man in the place where he least wanted to go and was least qualified to be. It is a wonder to me that the United States won the war.

I can say, having worked here in the Executive Office of the President at the time, that sometimes I wondered myself.

To cite only one example from my own case, I was interested in and qualified for radio training, but I was sent to airplane and engine mechanics school and given 6 months of training which turned out to be utterly useless. Anyone on the flight line would have had to be out of his mind to assign me to work on an airplane as a mechanic.

When I failed one course in A and E school, my CO called me in and threat-

ened to send me overseas as a rifleman in an alldrome security outfit. I agreed readily, because I wanted to get overseas. But he was only bluffing, and I was sent back to school and pushed through with barely passing grades.

As I have said, this is only one episode among many. I don't believe these things would be possible if the Army were forced to plan carefully and use its manpower efficiently, the way a civilian employer has to do. And if the Army (and the other service branches, too) had to attract men, they would get the right kind of men.

It would be an improvement if this were done on any terms, but it would probably also turn out to be cheaper to maintain a smaller contingent of well-paid, well-trained men with the kind of morale that can be developed only among volunteers, than it is to subsidize the monumental goldbricking society which an army of draftees inevitably tends to be. A lot of people think the draft is regrettable but necessary. I think it is basically un-American, and the facts would show that you can't defend liberty with an army that is not a product of the American way of free choice. If it could be done, that might be regrettable.

Well, this comment by my friend, Mr. Miller, simply dramatizes the point I would like to make. There is a sharp difference among us as to how to secure that strength. Certainly, if young men are not motivated adequately now, they will not be adequately motivated simply by the fact that you are changing the date of that law to 1933 from 1959. Better pay for recruits, a better program to hold reservists, wider use of civilians for support type of activity for transportation, housing and food, as well as wider use of local support overseas—this is the kind of thing that might make for more efficient use of manpower and might get greater strength with smaller numbers.

Then, also there is a difference among us as to the question of the assumption that you cannot secure an adequate force, regardless of the exact numbers thereof, without the draft. The distinguished chairman cites the experience in 1948 and in the report and in his opening remarks quoted from President Truman's message. I will call the attention of the House to the fact that in the year 1948, in March of 1948 when these observations were made, we were before the Czechoslovakian coup d'etat—we were speaking before the experience of the Berlin blockade and the Korean incident. The cold war, frankly, was not yet really on.

Yet, it seems to me it is a mistake to assume that the events of the past decade will have no influence on the opinions of young men and young women in this country. It is a similar mistake to assume that it has not any influence on our own opinion. Having lived through the war experience, we had such an attitude before 1948. You will recall that the President's military budget for 1947, with congressional support, was a \$15 billion budget and not a \$45 billion or \$46 billion budget as now. The assumption, therefore, that the 1948 experience is necessarily definitive for today, it seems to me, ignores a great deal of history that has taken place in the interim. It also ignores the change in the size of the labor force between that time and today. We were then getting

the depression babies coming of age. We are now getting the war babies coming of age, and there is a larger manpower pool.

But, my fundamental concern turns to the philosophy and psychology of our entire situation. As Americans, it seems to me we have a far more profound obligation than to worry about whether or not the military can change its personnel policies and get enough men—or must we give them this to secure draftees. Our fundamental concern must be—which way to peace? How shall America best be assured that the awesome weapons of mutual destruction which we have created need never be used? I, for one, should like to think that our energies would be devoted to following those paths which would demonstrate to the world that we do not seek another war—and that we do not seek any war but one war: the war that we should be seeking is the war against man's ancient enemies—disease, hunger, misery, and poverty. This is the only war in which all mankind can be victorious.

It seems to me we should be giving our attention, Mr. Chairman, to making the appeal to the young people and to the citizens everywhere, both at home and abroad, to devote the larger part of our energies, not to training men to man missiles of mass destruction, but rather to training young men as technical missionaries with slide rules, with medical kits, to fight communism on a positive basis and not to use guns and flame throwers to fight communism, but to go out into the world as missionaries of peace.

It seems to me that the younger generation today, as ever, are imaginative. They will respond creatively to a constructive alternative, but they are now depressed by the thought that the only hope for us is that we shall have a larger number of intercontinental ballistic missiles with which to rain down death and destruction upon the women and children and soldiers throughout the world.

It seems to me that we must examine very closely the basic proposition by which we are to be governed. For too long this Nation has been governed by its fears. I believe we all share the view that we are not really likely to face a new world war. We all know that no such war could be won. The only question would be, Shall the destruction of both our Nation and our enemies be consummated in 3 days or in 30 days? That essentially is the difference.

I think we should ask the military force to live without the draft. If we must have it, this Congress can be called into session and pass an extension of the draft in a very short time. But think of the psychological effect both at home and abroad, if we would turn our face toward peace, if we would devote our energies to that course of action which will build a more peaceful world. We must learn to live together or we shall surely die together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, the continuance of military conscription at this time is neither necessary nor desirable.

I have studied this issue thoroughly, and years of study and reflection have added to my conviction. As a result of my speaking publicly against this measure, I received letters from many people scattered across this land. Almost all of them urge me to speak for them in this House, and I believe that they represent the thinking of millions of Americans.

I have, in a few weeks, learned to love this citadel of liberty, but even more I love my country and its cherished traditions. I respect the leaders of this body and sincerely believe that my colleagues advocate what they consider right and proper. My love for my country and my convictions as to its best interests force me to differ with some of them on this issue. I know that they will respect my right to speak the truth as I see it, with all the force and directness available to me just as I will respect their rights.

I wish that I did not have to conclude that a cancerous militarism is growing in this country. It poses a threat to most of our institutions and creates an unevaluated inner peril. If this House continues to permit military leaders and their spokesmen to usurp the powers and duties of Congress, then Patrick Henry spoke in vain. All of us honor the officers and men who lead or maintain our defenses, but we should not permit them to unduly interfere in the formation of national policy or legislation. Washington recognized the danger, and Jefferson advocated a free civilian government. If we allow a modern Praetorian Guard to incubate as a menace to a modern Rome, we will have chosen Sparta at its worst in preference to Athens at its best. Must we imitate Germany because Russia has become a neighbor and competitor? Must we burn our house because we hear a wolf howl at our door? The answer is a ringing, everlasting no.

This great land of ours can find a positive way to peace. We can maintain an adequate military defense without crucifying our traditions and ideals on a double-edged sword. Make no mistake, the military state is such a sword. It may protect us from invasion, but it can lead to self-destruction or to dangerous adventuring. We have the moral force and the spiritual resources to forge an international system of law and order. We have the people and the economic strength to lead the world to justice and understanding. The way to positive solutions may be difficult, but who wants the easy path that leads to nowhere or to worse? I have no time or use for appeasement, but as long as I have access to this floor, I will fight for reason and for truth. I will not admit that the spirit of the men who followed William Penn to these shores is dead.

Why should we speed this bill to the Senate? I appeal to your sense of responsibility. We are no rubber stamp. Why should we relegate debate to the Senate? If this is the most important bill coming before the Armed Services

Committee, then I say that this House should combine duty and pride so as to be of service to the public in thoroughly evaluating it. What is the reason for rushing it through? Why were we not furnished the record of the hearings in time to weigh the pros and cons? Why should this House and the American people not be granted adequate time to fully consider and deliberate? Are we children for whom father knows best? The generals have spoken—let the American people have a chance to raise their voices, too. Perhaps I am living in a never, never land in which the voiceless masses of free Americans defer to a few admirals. I doubt it. I hope that I am not, because I do not know how such a country could be defended.

Here are 10 of the many reasons for not extending the draft:

First. We can have better defense with volunteer, career professional forces. The need is for quality rather than for quantity.

Second. Well-paid forces provide better defense at less expense under such conditions.

Third. We have no right to conscript labor at substandard rates nor to maintain a system riddled with inequities.

Fourth. The Pentagon itself knows that the system is wrong.

Fifth. The Pentagon and others push this bill only because they are afraid to try to change it. They will not make the effort unless forced to do so, and they fear discussion, because they know that the entire issue is explosive and riddled with legitimate grounds for objections.

Sixth. It interferes with the proper development of our youthful manpower.

Seventh. It weakens the total strength of our country which must include science, industry, agriculture, and other fields, as well as the military.

Eighth. It is wasteful in every way.

Ninth. It lulls us into a false sense of security and hinders the mobilizing of moral and spiritual forces while inculcating militaristic doctrine.

Tenth. It violates our traditions and conflicts with much of our moral and religious thinking. This does not contribute to our international standing or to peaceful solutions of world problems.

A full case against conscription cannot be developed in a few minutes when the issue merits many hours of study. However, I can alert you to the dangers of passing such a bill—particularly under forced pressure. This calls dramatic attention to the even greater dangers in militarism that threaten our way of life.

This is much more than the voting on an Army draft bill. American democracy is on trial. It may be later than we think in the cycles of history. I hope that this is not so, but shadows of handwriting appear upon the wall. This means that we may face in militarism an inner danger almost as great as the external dangers. We might destroy ourselves while trying to protect ourselves.

In closing, I would like to call your attention to words from the constitution of Vermont which call for frequent recurrence to fundamental principles

in order to preserve the blessing of liberty and keep government free. This I urge you to consider.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Can the gentleman tell me what the position of the A.F. of L. and CIO is in regard to the 4-year extension?

Mr. MEYER. As I understand it, they would prefer the 2 years with a study commission.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Could a study really be made during the 2 years so that at the end of that time we could come up with a better program with a more efficient use of manpower and a wiser expenditure of the tax dollars?

Mr. MEYER. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does the gentleman know what the position of the national chamber of commerce is?

Mr. MEYER. They are for the 2 years.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. They are also in favor of only a 2-year extension of the draft and recommend that a study be made of the many criticisms that have been leveled against the drafts it operates today?

Mr. MEYER. That is right, as I understand it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, good and adequate reasons for extending the induction authority to July 1, 1963, have been presented. The Nation needs the draft to insure that we keep the Armed Forces at the minimum strength.

But there are some other considerations involved. It seems to me important to recognize other reasons for extending the draft.

It has been made perfectly plain that the recruiting efforts of all the armed services are successful only to the extent that the draft boards provide the recruiters with a strong prospect.

Every boy, by the time he is 17, knows that he will register with his local board at 18. He knows that he will probably be called into service. In many cases, this is all the incentive he needs to enlist.

For boys 18 and older, the local board has every name and address. If this fact does not make the man ready to enlist, there is further processing which will bring him closer to service. Eventually he is classified. If he is in I-A, he can be pretty sure that except for failure to pass the physical, mental, or moral tests, he is going to go. He may delay it with a deferment for a time, but his call is pretty certain. These men are already more than half sold as enlistees. Then, when he has been examined by the armed services and found acceptable for induction, he has his last chance to make a choice—either enlist, or wait to be drafted.

No one will deny that the recruiting services rely heavily on this processing—

and on the virtual certainty of eventual service by every qualified man—to produce enlistees. This is as it should be. It is certainly in keeping with American principles to provide every opportunity and the maximum time for a citizen to voluntarily perform a fundamental duty of citizenship. For those to whom the opportunity to choose is not important, the Selective Service System provides an extremely fair and considerate method of determining when a citizen shall perform his military duty.

It is interesting to note that hundreds of local board clerks have been honored with citations and certificates by the recruiting services. The recruiters in the field know and value the aid these clerks give them; the help they receive by the fact that the Selective Service System exists and is operational.

None of this is intended to reflect on the recruiting services. They do a fine job. But it emphasizes the vital role Selective Service plays in the manpower procurement process. No man is forced to decide when and how to fill the obligation to help defend his country. On the other hand, time and ways for everyone to make his own choice are provided.

And if every qualified man exercised that choice, there would still be no reason to assume that the draft was no longer needed. In such an event, there would be no necessity to induct men. But there would still be the need to be prepared to induct men. There would remain the need to keep compulsion in the background to induce men to make their own choice of time and place to serve.

It should be remembered also, that it isn't enough to have 500,000 men volunteer to meet the needs of the armed services for 500,000 men. Let us assume that the existence of the draft induced these half million men to volunteer. Would they volunteer in the proper proportions for the different branches of the Armed Forces? Would they volunteer in the proper proportion for the particular types of duty offered by any one armed service?

There is a tendency to misread the meaning of fluctuating draft calls. Whether a call for one month is higher or lower than the previous month has little if any bearing on the need for the draft. Nor does the trend toward smaller calls, or toward larger calls, really affect the fundamental requirement that the Nation stand ready to enforce, insofar as is necessary, the obligation of each citizen to help defend the Nation.

The role that the Selective Service System plays in our total defense structure is obscured, also, by overemphasizing the actual numbers inducted, or the effect of the draft in stimulating enlistments. We have developed in this country a unique, proven, and highly accepted method of bringing men into the service. I refer specifically to the local board system. These boards are composed of leading members of their community. They know the area and the people with whom they deal. They are required to be civilians. They exercise, subject to appeal, sole authority to classify and select men for service. Practically every

community has its own board, and in larger cities, there are many boards but with jurisdiction based on geographical neighborhoods and population density.

In its area, the local board has an unequaled accumulation of data on manpower from age 18 to 35. It is not difficult to visualize the value of this grassroots organization, and the information it possesses, in the event of a nuclear attack. The distinct portions of the Selective Service System, including separate local boards, are capable of operating in isolation should the need arise. They are able to furnish manpower data to any authorized emergency user. And the boards have taken measures to preserve duplicate vital records in vulnerable areas. There would be retained in the event of such a disaster, a local capacity to guide manpower utilization for survival.

The local boards have a real influence on manpower utilization in other ways, too. Everyone is aware of the necessity for the fullest use of technical manpower, and the need to increase the supply of that manpower and to improve its use. By deferring students, by deferring men engaged in teaching, science, engineering, research, and other pursuits vital to the national interest, selective service has helped tremendously to ease our shortages and influence the proper use of skilled men in civilian life. Men are deferred to prepare for these callings, and are deferred to follow them. The prospects of deferment serve to hold men in those fields when better pay might otherwise lure them into more lucrative but less vital activities, from the standpoint of national strength.

Thousands of college students were deferred during the Korean war. It is fair to say, that had there not been those deferments, many of them granted under a nationwide testing program established by the System, this country would now have 50,000 to 60,000 fewer skilled engineers, scientists, and researchers than it has today.

The Korean war also is an excellent illustration of the value of a draft system in being. The Selective Service System was reestablished in June 1948. A few thousand men were inducted. Enlistments climbed spectacularly. But our forces were subsequently reduced so that for a period of nearly 18 months draft-stimulated enlistments met the needs of the reduced Armed Forces for men.

A skeleton of the Selective Service System was preserved. It was badly hampered by a reduced budget and a long period of inactivity. But the boards existed, and although consolidated wherever possible, each had some clerical help.

Despite this rundown state of the System, when the Korean war broke out we were able to deliver men within 60 days—about as fast as it is possible to do so. If the System had been disbanded, the period would have been more like several months—a timelag which in Korea might have meant disaster.

There is more at stake than putting men into the Active and Reserve Forces in peacetime. Those are the prime objectives—part of the end product. They

certainly make extension mandatory. But in extending this authority to induct 4 more years, we are preserving what very well may be the indispensable foundation to our capacity to strengthen our Nation and retain our capacity to survive.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I commend the gentleman on his statement and associate myself with his remarks. I have attended the hearings with respect to this legislation and I am satisfied in my mind that there is absolutely no alternative to extending the draft 4 years, as provided by this bill.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that some other points should be made in the interest of a fuller understanding of all that is involved in our draft system. The need for extension of the induction authority to maintain the active forces is recognized.

It may not have been made so clear that the strength and stability of the Reserve and National Guard, air and ground, also depend on the draft.

The effect of the draft on the guard and Reserves is much the same as it is on enlistments into the Active Forces. Men enter the guard and Reserves in many cases because by doing so they are deferred from induction. And the man who enters a guard or Reserve unit has every reason to remain there and to be an effective member. If he drops satisfactory training, he loses his deferment, as a minimum penalty, and then is subject in his turn to induction. In the case of some enlistments into the Reserves or National Guard, a man who fails to continue to participate satisfactorily is subject to a penalty induction out of turn and regardless of other grounds for deferment that may exist.

It should be understood that the local boards make no decisions in these latter cases. If the guard or Reserve unit certifies a man as subject to the penalty induction provisions, then the Selective Service System simply complies with the certification. Although few men have been inducted in this way, the existence of this penalty does help to keep men in good standing in the Reserve and guard units.

The success of the 6-month training program is by now well known. Its success is due, it may be said almost entirely due, to the fact that participation in it provides deferment from induction. Not only have the Guard and Reserves attained strength goals, but of equal importance, the state of training of these vital support forces has reached a high level. No longer must there be a constant repetition of basic training. The initial 6 months of active duty for training, and the reduction of turnover in Reserve and Guard units allow training to progress. Turnover is reduced because men remain in and participate satisfactorily in lieu of being inducted for 2 years of active duty.

Now the Reserve I have been speaking about is the Ready Reserve.

But the same considerations apply to the other elements of the Reserve components. And those elements are important to our defense posture. They represent the reservoir of men with more or less training, some still obligated to train, others volunteer reservists. They include a large number of individuals with rare and valuable skills the services would need in a mobilization. They include men who have had some military training or service.

So long as the future remains uncertain every man-day of military training in the population is valuable. And when less than all the population has training in the elements of physical survival, it is important that society make the best use of those who do have it. Therefore, these reservists—inactive as they may be—are a part of our strength. They may well be a key part of it.

The members of these second- and third-line Reserves who are not veterans are likewise not being inducted so long as they are satisfactorily members of those Reserve components. They are doing something. They are not and should not be inducted while there are men making no contribution, who are qualified and available, to man the active forces.

Part of this second line of reservists—the Standby Reserve—is subject to recall to active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress. But in 1955, Congress provided that such men could then be recalled only after they were determined by the Director of Selective Service to be available.

There is good reason for that provision of the law, as perhaps all of us recall. In the rush to meet the challenge posed by the Korean war, the recall of reservists to active duty often resulted in hardships and inequities to individuals; penalized families and civilian activities, and not always served the purposes of the Armed Forces effectively.

It was to prevent that kind of indiscriminate recall of reservists that Congress directed the Selective Service System to evaluate each reservist to determine where he should serve. The local boards now maintain a constant processing of the records of these men. They number at present 1,500,000 and the number is growing still. A decision must be reached in every case whether the reservist should be available for recall, or whether in the national interest he should be left in a vital civilian job or to care for dependents. The names of those available for recall are reported to the Armed Forces.

It will be apparent that this is not a job to be done once. The man available today may be in vital research tomorrow, and vice versa. In order for the list of available reservists to have any meaning, it must be as current as it is possible to keep it. So the local boards constantly must cull through these reservists to insure a better utilization of this segment of our trained and partially trained manpower in the event of need.

We must continue to manage our potential military manpower, especially

that part of it which has had some training against the day when the skills they have learned in survival may be needed.

The Selective Service System is the only agency in existence with the experience and the organization to carry out that kind of a job. And it is a job which must inevitably grow, until that time which we all fervently seek arrives—when we need not maintain a potent military organization in being; and when we need not view as urgent the necessity to train our citizens to survive in nuclear war. But that day is not foreseeable. Until it is here, we cannot risk the Nation's existence by failing to take every possible step to remain strong.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if anyone was elected to Congress under an illusion that there would not be difficult decisions to be made here or distasteful choices to be made, I feel that it is good that he is disillusioned so early in the session. This is a question which none of us approach with any great joy. Those who have dealt with this question from the beginning, in 1940, do so without any feeling of satisfaction that this must be done. However, we have found in the past, and the hearings now sustain the fact, that it is necessary that a continuance of the power to induct be made at this time.

I have no quarrel with anyone, whether in this Chamber or not, who is conscientiously opposed to military service or anything of that kind. While I disagree with his conclusion, I respect the fact that he has that conclusion, that it is his belief, and I would be among those first to defend his right to so believe, and do so with absolute respect for the opinion which he holds.

The situation is this: This is not a military Nation. Very few of the American people have any desire to pursue a military career. So we have found over the years, and we have found since 1940, that in order to maintain an adequate military force we must attract and hold practically all of those Americans who have a desire to pursue a military career and who at the same time possess the aptitude for a military career.

We have found in the past as we know now that we cannot maintain what is now regarded as the minimum force necessary without compulsion with respect to the entrance of young men into the service. Now in what situation is the Congress on this subject? Last year when the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense was here, this Congress appropriated funds for 30,000 more members of the Army than had been requested by the President and the Department of Defense. Additional sums for the regular components of the Army and Marine Corps were provided and we expressed the sense of the Congress that those were the minimum numbers required for the safety of the United States during fiscal year 1959. We provided a figure and the funds necessary

to pay the reserve components in excess of the number requested by the President and the administration. In that instance we went even further. We used language which on its face is mandatory—that the reserve components shall be maintained at the higher figure. That was the attitude of this Congress, about the middle of last year when the appropriation bill came here. So that we are positively on record for maintaining that type of force.

During the hearings and here on the floor, there has been some mention made of the question of pay and forced labor in order to get men for less than the current pay. Mention was made of the Cordiner report. As the chairman of the subcommittee which considered that report and wrote the pay bill, I regard myself as being one of the very few people in the United States outside of the Cordiner committee itself who ever read the complete Cordiner committee report. We considered that report and the minimums suggested by the Cordiner report is what we adopted. Complaint is made as to the disparity between the increases in the top ratings. There we cut down very materially on what the Cordiner committee had recommended. But any idea that a recruit or private in the service is secured at a reduced wage is a complete fallacy. I know of nothing which is used by the Government of the United States which costs more than the private soldier. True, he enters at \$78 per month. I would like to know where there is another young man in the age bracket who has room and board, clothes, medical and dental care and everything else that goes into making a living and yet has \$78 or \$87 or \$90 a month left after he has paid off these charges against him. The only thing in the world that that man has to buy when he is in the service is his toothpaste, shaving cream, blades and his laundry and haircuts. That is all in the world that he is required to pay out of the money that he gets. In addition to that, his dependents are taken care of under the Dependents Assistance Act which is continued by the provisions of this bill. His dependents have the right to medical care either in Government hospitals or in private hospitals with the Government picking up the check for everything except the first \$25 in private hospitals. Whenever anyone attempts to bring forth any question that these young men are acquired at a cut rate for labor or that he is not costing you lots of money, I hope proper reflection will be made and that these other items will be taken into consideration in that regard.

Mention has been made as to General Maddux who worked with our committee on the pay question and again with reference to the Cordiner Committee report. Of course, what those gentlemen were talking about were the highly skilled and trained technicians. They were urging a pay scale for proficiency in a specialty, a type of pay which was being brought back for the first time in a very long time. Back about 1940 or 1942 we had specialist pay where a man could be a private, but in addition to that pay he would also draw specialist

pay as a saddlemaker, a horseshoer, a musician, and things of that kind. But this was a new departure for proficiency. The Congress established a proficiency pay system. It does not apply only to technicians, of course, because all of these people in the military service are auxiliary to the fighting men. Their responsibility in the service is to keep that fighter on the front, in the planes, in the submarines, and on the carriers. Everything else is auxiliary to keeping that man on the front. The highest efficiency you could have would be that required in combat. There have been many types of figures and percentages used here. I would not attempt to go into all of them, because frankly I do not remember all the things that go into them. But if you will turn to page 38 of the hearings—and I assure you that these figures are reliable—you will find the figures that come from official sources.

While I do not always like the attitude of the executive departments toward the Congress, I will have to say that in a period of 20 years here I have not known them to give us deliberately false statistics on a matter of this kind. These are reliable figures and can be accepted exactly as you find them in this report. It is very revealing, because it is divided as to all regulars. First, term regulars and then career regulars. Let's look at the career regular, the fellow who reenlists for his second term. Where are we with him? In the entire Department of Defense during the first 4 months of fiscal 1959 we were reenlisting 87.9 percent of them. In the Army it was 86.2 percent; in the Navy 90.4 percent; the Marine Corps, 76.8 percent; the Air Force, 91 percent. Those are the people who are military career minded and oriented. These are the people from whom you will be able at all times and under all circumstances to draw your military force, provided you pay them adequately and give them the other benefits which must go with a military career. We are attracting 87.9 percent of the whole, but that leaves us approximately 250,000 people who at all times are serving as inductees in the Army. The idea that because the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marines are so attractive that they do not have to induct men can hardly be sustained. I do not believe you could say a boy chose the Marine Corps because he would not have an opportunity to fight. He wants to choose his own branch. The same is true of the Navy and of the Air Force. But what do we find among inductees? These boys have been reenlisting at a rate of 2.7 percent in 1955; 4 percent in 1958; and 5 percent at present. So we are consistently improving. But, from those who are not career minded or career motivated, we must supplement the number on active duty by the compulsion of the draft and the induction of individuals. Of course, complaint has been made in the hearings before the committee that it is discriminatory; that it is not universal. The law says it is "the Universal Training and Service Act." I would be the last to contend that this is not discriminatory to a degree, and perhaps to a sub-

stantial degree, but it is always going to be discriminatory until such time as the Congress of the United States, sustained by the American people, is willing to go into an all-out universal training program in the United States. When you do that, then there will be no discrimination, and the burden will fall equally on all.

I have bloodied my head many times in trying to pass a universal training act. Thus far the people are not going to sustain it, as reflected by the Members of Congress. As long as you do not have that program there is going to be an element of discrimination.

I agree thoroughly with those who say that the proper way to maintain peace is to follow the dictates of religion and charity. I do not believe there are many people in the United States you are going to have to convince that that is the proper way to do it. My trouble has always been that we have made no headway with the Russians in getting them to sincerely agree to that, believe in it and agree to follow it. Until such time as they do I think the vast majority of us must confess the fact that we must maintain the adequate military force which is provided in present law.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have no quarrel with what the gentleman says about the number of men needed in the armed services and I am not one of those who think that you can have a few men and get by just because you have a lot of new weapons; nor do I believe that the country that uses equipment that costs the most will necessarily win the war. The gentleman from Texas argues for a 4-year extension. What has happened in the past will happen again. What has actually happened in the past is that the nation that had the greatest number of ground forces could cover the ground with their power and win the war. I assume that the same thing will happen again.

I listened to the gentleman's reference to the figure in his report on page 38. I am interested also in the figures on page 32 which show a very low percentage of reservists. I think we are all aware of the tremendous assets of Reserves, and those of us who went through the first bad times of the war, early in the war, know the extremely important part the Reserves played. As a matter of fact there were so many of them at the front that the West Point professional gold braid officers had a hard time to get in the line and get their chance. That is just about the situation that existed at that time. The Reserves are a terrific military force and they sustain themselves.

My question to the gentleman from Texas is: Why is it that we do not have more Reserves and especially Ready Reserves instead of having to turn to these 2-year inductees?

Mr. KILDAY. There are a number of questions involved in the gentleman's one question. For a very long period of time the inductee going out of the

service was not required to perform Active Reserve service. There was a hiatus in the law under which there was no power in the Military Department to assign the man with a Reserve obligation to a Reserve unit. That situation is being corrected now where we take men in for a 6-month training period and they then go into the Reserves or the National Guard. And the 2-year inductee has a Reserve obligation which must be discharged in a Reserve component unit. So the Reserves are going to be built up more in the future.

Of course, the number that you can retain in pay status is going to depend upon the amount of money appropriated by Congress for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is the military department willing to cooperate in maintaining a large Ready Reserve force to take the place of some of these inductees? Or is there something that could be done other than merely extending the same law for another 4 years?

Mr. KILDAY. I mentioned as part of the Reserve problem a minute ago that Congress requires the maintenance of a larger Reserve force than was requested by the President and the Department of Defense. That will remain the law until June 30, 1959, unless a similar provision or the identical provision is placed in the appropriations for 1960. That floor will not be under the Reserve components after July 1, 1959; and it is the intention of the Department of Defense to go ahead with that reduction. That is contrary to what Congress feels as expressed in the appropriation bill; and the mandatory language used in that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Then is it fair to state, may I ask the gentleman: Those of us who feel that there should be more Ready Reserves to take the place of some of these 2-year inductees, the thing to do is when the appropriations come up to be working at that time for a larger appropriation?

Mr. KILDAY. That is about what you are going to have to decide, if you are going to decide to use ready reservists, completely in lieu of men on active duty, but your active duty force is going to have to always and inevitably be your first line of defense. Reserve components come afterwards.

Our Ready Reserve is quite considerable, 2,443,047 as of November 30, 1958. This is as of November 30, 1958. In the National Guard it is 434,274, the Army Reserve 998,477, Naval Reserve 543,588, Marine Corps 216,161, Air National Guard 70,377, Air Force Reserve 182,107. In addition to that you have the Standby Reserve, a total of over a million and a half. Then you have, of course, the retired Reserves which I do not believe should be taken into this calculation, although it is continued in the Army National Guard figure.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is my understanding that there are a number of 2-year inductees that were taking basic training. They told me that after the basic training they were shifted to some camp and mostly for the balance of the 2 years they looked at the side of barracks and learned how to goldbrick. Why are not the boys sent home so that

they can get a job, support themselves, and pursue their civil status?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know how it is operating in Iowa, how these boys were handled while they are in for 2 years. The fellows from Texas I see do a pretty fair 2 years of service and they carry out their Reserve obligations after they return from 6 months or 2 years of service. That is my experience with that. I think there is one thing involved in the gentleman's thinking that perhaps should be mentioned and that is the attitude of the administration at this time. They think it is safe to reduce our Reserve component strength at the same time they are reducing the Regular component strength. That is a proposition with which I personally do not agree, and I do not believe a majority of the Committee on Armed Services agrees to that. It is quite evident that the majority of both Houses of Congress do not agree to that. That was because of language placed in the appropriation bill last year. But that is the stated policy of the administration at this time, that they will reduce the Reserve components while reducing the Regular components. That is contrary to the things that this committee has said here and that we have sold to the Congress over a period of years.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. One last question. We have long since given up hope of getting anything with our leadership in the White House. The point is if they will not take the leadership on this, is there anything that the Congress can do?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not going to blast the White House today because we are on the same side. We are doing all right as of today. We will take that up when we get to another subject.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware that the Reserve officers met here only very recently, in the past 6 months. I have never had so many complaints from Reserve officer organizations or from Reserve officers complaining of the lack of programs. What has happened to our Reserve program? Do we actually have a Reserve, except on paper?

Mr. KILDAY. I think we have the best Reserve components now that we have had within my experience. We certainly have a very fine National Guard with six divisions anticipated to be ready for very prompt service.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking of the Reserves.

Mr. KILDAY. I was coming to that. We have the Reserve organizations. Some of them are excellent. The Air Force Reserve I am acquainted with is fine. They have their planes that they fly regularly. A good many of them are troop carriers. They are ready to take off at any time.

Mr. GROSS. The Air Force Reserves is one of the Reserve organizations in my district that is complaining the most that they do not have proper training courses.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know what has happened in Iowa. The gentleman

complains about his State. If that is the experience in Iowa I do not believe it is in accordance with the majority of the experience in the United States.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in some measure he believes the privates in our Armed Forces could not earn more elsewhere, and they are getting all they are worth? It is my understanding that many of these young men could make much more than that. I would like to say that farming is generally considered a low-paid occupation, and I know of young men that would compare with privates that make as much as \$40 a week and their room and board to help on farms.

Mr. KILDAY. These young men also receive medical care and 30 days leave and medical care for their families?

Mr. MEYER. No; I did not say that. Did I understand the gentleman to say that privates were only getting what they were worth?

Mr. KILDAY. No; but I will say to the gentleman, if he had been here as long as I have, he would not let anybody run him into a hole like that. What I was saying here was—and I mean it absolutely—that when you start talking about substandard pay and forced labor for far less than the going wage, you must take into consideration that \$78 is the least that anybody in the military service gets, and that in addition to that he gets everything that goes into his living except his toilet articles, his haircuts, and his laundry, and that must be taken into consideration along with all of these other benefits.

Mr. MEYER. I understand that.

Mr. KILDAY. As to what a boy can do in the service, I will go further than that. I know of nothing that the average high school boy can do in the United States—I am not talking about the man going to college; I am not talking about the man going into a family business or who has a lot of investments to see him through the rest of his life; I am talking about the young man out of high school. Usually he is going to work in a bank or in a business or a factory or anywhere else. But, there is nothing in the world that he can do that will guarantee him the future that enlisting as a recruit in any of the military services will guarantee him, and guarantee him the right to retire after 20 years of service, when he is only about 38 if he goes in directly out of high school, at one-half of his pay, and if he behaves himself and works hard in the military service, as he would have to do in any private employment, he will have advanced to a position in the military establishment where he will be well and adequately taken care of after 20 years and his dependents taken care of thereafter; and if he goes for 30 years, when he is only 48 years of age, he will come out with 75 percent of his base pay. And if he has worked the way it is anticipated and hoped that he will, he will go out with a trade, as a trained worker; and he still has quite a little time to

work before he starts drawing his social security. And, among the benefits I failed to mention awhile ago is that now these military people are also full participants in the social security program in addition to all of their privileges and benefits as to retirement and what-not in the military services. They were granted both, without a deduction of their retired pay. They are the only public employees in the United States who have the full privilege of noncontributory retired pay and of social security, too.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PORTER. If the program is so attractive, then why has it not been sold, in which case there would be enough volunteers?

Mr. KILDAY. One reason is that too many men in this House get up every day and say there is nothing available for the military serviceman. That is one of the reasons. And, another reason is that there are some people in high places in the military establishment who, as soon as we pass one benefit, start seeking another benefit.

Mr. PORTER. I do not understand the gentleman. Does he mean that if we changed our statements here they would not try to get more benefits?

Mr. KILDAY. I know the gentleman is attempting to run me into another hole.

Mr. PORTER. I hope not.

Mr. KILDAY. I have told the gentleman where I stand on it, and that is the situation as it exists. Is the gentleman going to vote to extend the draft?

Mr. PORTER. I doubt it.

Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. I do really want to understand the gentleman's point about what this House should do differently so that volunteers would fill our ranks instead of conscripts. I would appreciate the gentleman's answering the question directly.

Mr. KILDAY. I will attempt to answer the gentleman directly.

What the gentleman was asking me was one of those old "Have you quit beating your wife" questions. If the gentleman takes the position, if it is so attractive why do not more people enlist, I answered him that one reason, and I assure the gentleman it is a very substantial reason, is because some people in the Congress of the United States, who are not conversant with the benefits made available to members of the Military Establishment, continue to make speeches to the effect that we pay them practically nothing, that we use the draft to secure forced labor, and things of that kind. That goes out to the young men of the country. They do not know any more about the facts than the gentlemen who make those statements, so they believe it.

Mr. PORTER. I have never heard such a speech in the brief time I have been a Member of this House.

Mr. KILDAY. Has the gentleman listened to himself on occasion?

Mr. PORTER. I have never made such a statement. If the gentleman would point it out to me, I would be glad to have him do so.

Mr. KILDAY. I yield no further to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his stand because, of course, we have the draft for the protection of our country. Also, we ought to remember that the majority of servicemen are not drafted, they are volunteers. They might have the feeling they might be, but at least they go into the service voluntarily. I think it ought to be a career service, and I agree with the gentleman on that. Many people like the service. Those in the Reserves think it is a fine group and one of the greatest organizations we could ever belong to.

Mr. KILDAY. On the face of the figures I used before, of the 900,000 we had in the Regular Army up to the beginning of fiscal 1959 only 250,000 were draftees, so 650,000 were volunteers. But the others are not military career men.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill reported from the committee. I recognize very well, after the brilliant exposition by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], precise and yet comprehensive, that there is little that could be said that would not be redundant, but I do believe we should emphasize some of the things which he called to our attention.

Constantly interwoven into the fabric of our people, from the inception of the country even until today, is the abundantly clear picture that our people are not military minded. Many escaped from the continent in the hope of being free of the militarism of Europe.

While there is a justifiable pride in the uniforms of the armed services and a willingness to serve when the threat to our security appears imminent, yet in the normal course of events, Americans are predominantly civilians at heart. It is good that this is so. Still in a cold war which presents dangers that are real, if not imminent, the military posture of defense cannot be attained without a draft at the force levels considered necessary to our security.

In an ardent and natural desire to eliminate the draft, it has been suggested that a more attractive service could be composed of entirely professional men and women. For many years, the Armed Services Committee has dedicated itself to improving the services as a career and much beneficial legislation toward that end has been enacted.

Family housing has been augmented to a great degree, commissaries and post exchanges have been improved, reenlistment bonuses have been increased, incentive pay has been added, survivors'

benefits have been enlarged, retired pay will soon cost a billion dollars a year, and the Contingency Option Act permits servicemen to leave annuities for their families in the event of death after retirement. There are other meritorious programs and all have had a considerable effect upon those who would consider the service as a career. However, the gap between those who would serve voluntarily and the number required by the Department of Defense is still a wide one. While estimates vary, a reasonable judgment would reflect a shortage of approximately a million men if the draft was to be terminated.

While the draft has been universal in its title, it never has been in fact. While universality implies a degree of fairness that a Selective Service program does not suggest, it is not realistic and creates more problems and inefficiencies than the program currently in effect. Last year, the Congress established new ground rules and tightened the standards for inductees. Since that time, the services have increased in efficiency, added to their combat effectiveness, and in the case of the Army, three out of its five detention barracks have been closed.

Under present procedures today, 7 out of 10 of the young men reaching the age of 26 have entered the service and 9 out of the qualified men have been called to active duty.

While it would be appealing to most of us to extend the draft for a period of less than four years, I would suggest that there is nothing on the horizon which encourages us toward the belief that the dangers and tensions are liable to be lessened during that period. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon our committee to review this matter constantly and take any action in the interim that circumstances dictate.

The last two extensions of the draft have been for a similar period. Let us face the facts grimly and tell the world that we shall remain strong until there is better assurance that we can live in a peaceful and honorable world without the need of military strength to assure that great goal which we all seek.

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it would certainly be superfluous for me to add anything to what has been said on this bill. The bill has been eloquently, clearly, and intelligently discussed by the chairman of our committee, by the ranking member, and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and others. These people have labored long in this field—far longer than I have. They have forgotten more about it than I will ever know. But I would like to say something on this very subject. All those who came before us from the Department of Defense testified in favor of this piece of legislation. There were no ifs ands, or buts. They told us very frankly that we needed the extension—the 4-year extension—of the draft for the safe-

guarding of our country, first, and also for the preservation of freedom in the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we must remember one thing in these days, and that is that military science is the field of experts. It is abundantly clear to me from what I have heard on this floor today that many people speak about these things more with their hearts than with their heads. While this has been an extremely laudable thing, and we are all trying for the same goal, it is not a valuable contribution. We have to listen to experts in defense. We have to listen to our leaders, military, naval, Air Force, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others who have this problem in their life every day, men who know what we are up against. It is impossible for everyone in the United States to understand the formidable adversary that we have and what it may mean to our country. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will heed the warnings of those people, who want peace just as much as anybody wants peace, and finally, Mr. Chairman, to paraphrase an old expression, only the strong deserve peace. We cannot be strong without the passage of this draft act. Many of us deplore it. I deplore it. It was my hope that the age be lowered. I do not like to see our young men kept on the string so long, until the age of 35. But I bow to the knowledge of those who have studied this question and who also want our young men to have all the freedom that they can possibly have for a brilliant and prosperous future. But how can they have that brilliant and prosperous future unless they and we keep our country strong, even if it is at some sacrifice. I believe that our people, by and large, want us to keep this country strong, so that we can insure a lasting and just peace.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to say that perhaps the testimony of some of the personnel of our Armed Forces has not been heard. In personal conversation with one of our highest ranking generals, he said he did not favor the draft.

I have a letter, dated Washington, Kans., January 13, which refers back quite a few years to Adm. Hillen Koetter and, if you will bear with me, it says:

If he would have spoken out publicly he would have gotten the ax one way or the other.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman that, after all, I can only quote the testimony in the hearings. If people write letters in which they say "if they had spoken out publicly," I cannot know what is in the back of their minds. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] opened his remarks by saying that if anyone was elected to the House of Rep-

resentatives under the illusion that all he was going to have was a happy time and not have to look forward to the day when he had to vote on unpleasant things, now is the time he would find one of the unpleasant things facing him and facing all of us. I want to agree with all that has been said by the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. In my time on that committee I have developed not only a great respect for him, but a great admiration for the time and the knowledge, the capability with which he handles all problems that come before the Committee on Armed Services. I pay my compliment to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for his knowledge and his ability and for the presentation he has made before us.

I just want to say, of course, there are opponents to drafting our men into the service, but most of us have served in the military in one war or another and served on the battlefields of the wars.

Our sons, too, have served in the military service and served in the wars of this country, particularly in World War II and in Korea.

Today there is no doubt in the mind of anyone that with the cold war so prevalent that we must maintain our forces at a strength that will be the greatest deterrent to any potential aggressor. But one thing comes to mind and is very clear today, and that is why I take the floor.

You know when the war was on, and particularly World War II, I remember how everyone bowed to our military leaders in the field, and on every proposition that would come before Congress how readily they adhered to and how willingly listened to the advice given to us by our military men. We felt they were leaders of great experience and that when our sons went into battle they would go under competent leaders. So we followed their advice very willingly because the bands were playing, flags were flying, and the guns were rumbling in our ears; so we listened to them. But is it not strange that when the fighting stopped we did not hear the bands any longer or the rumbling of the guns and we begin to tell our military leaders how they should run their affairs.

I do not subscribe to that. Surely they can make mistakes in judgment. So do we here in this House.

But just think of it. In the hearings we have had before our committee the top civilian minds on defense, the top military minds on defense, testified not merely as to the need of the continuance of the draft but also the fact that we need it for necessary planning for a period of 4 years. All of us listened day after day to the testimony, and I assure you that with the questioning that took place I could not even remotely doubt the sincerity of these people who believe in the program for this and other reasons which the military stated.

And I say to you that this is a very unpleasant task for me to vote again that my neighbor's son must be drafted into the military service. But I also recognize that I have a responsibility assumed when the Speaker administered

the oath of office to me every 2 years, a responsibility to my Nation. I shall maintain that responsibility, and I am sure the great majority of the Members of this House will assume their full responsibility today and enact this legislation as presented by the great chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still unable to understand what is sacred about the figure 4, that is 4 years, why this act must be extended for 4 years. I have read the hearings and I find no logical argument for continuing the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

In my opinion, the situation we have here today is healthy in that the Armed Services Committee should come to Congress on this subject at least every 2 years. I would prefer a 1-year extension, but I am willing to compromise on 2 years. I cannot support 4 years.

In reading the hearings, on page 38, I find a statement by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], a member of the Armed Service Committee. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] stated:

The thing that I am going to be particularly interested in understanding as we proceed with this bill is, No. 1, we are increasing the enlistment rate, and No. 2, we have stepped up the voluntary enlistments, and No. 3, we are reducing the size of the Reserves, we are reducing the size of the active forces, and still we talk about having to continue with the draft program.

Now, if we have to continue with the draft act in order to get people to voluntarily enlist, maybe that is a necessary evil. But it is a little difficult to understand why we need to continue the draft act for 4 years in the light of improvements in enlistments and reenlistments, and all of the other incentives that have been created, coupled with the fact that we are having a reduced regular service and a reduction in the Reserves—and where in the world are we going to put all these boys that are coming in under the 6-month program if we are going to continue to reduce our Reserve forces.

I read that statement by the gentleman from Virginia and then I read quite carefully the rest of the hearings, but I find no answers to the questions he raised. Perhaps there is someone on the committee who would be willing to provide some of the answers today.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Virginia, who is one of the most diligent and hard working Members of Congress.

Mr. HARDY. I am not going to try to answer the questions which I raised myself, but I do want to say to the gentleman that one of the purposes I had in mind in raising that question was that I am considerably disturbed by the attitude of the Department of Defense in reducing our standing forces below that which the Congress indicated they ought to maintain. That was the purpose I was trying to develop at that point.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman raised other good questions. He will agree with me, I am sure, he did not get answers to some of his questions.

Mr. HARDY. I will have to agree with that. The Pentagon frequently does not give all of the answers it should.

Mr. GROSS. On page 36 of the hearings, and I would like to reiterate and reemphasize this, we have the testimony of Assistant Secretary Finucane in which he stated:

So it seems to me that 4 years has become established by custom.

What are we asked to do today, extend conscription of American boys for 4 years to satisfy custom or are we extending the Draft Act because it is necessary?

Then I turn to page 47 and refer to the testimony in part of General Taylor:

Finally, I would just say that in the present international climate any reduction of the time of our draft extension would suggest, I am afraid, to our allies, that perhaps we don't think the situation is particularly serious, and I think it would have serious adverse psychological impacts abroad as well as at home.

Are we being called upon to extend the Draft Act for 4 years to please foreign governments, or are we extending it for 4 years because it is necessary?

I call attention again to the table to be found in the hearings on page 50 and refer to the periods of obligated service in foreign countries and the fact that the British are contemplating eliminating their conscription program altogether in 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to a 4-year extension. I hope the amendment to extend it for 2 years will be adopted, and I would prefer to support an amendment for 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI].

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, in our present circumstances, we have no alternative but to extend the military draft. The question that is being debated on the floor today and in your minds is whether we should extend the draft for 2 years or for 4 years. The more fundamental problem that we in Congress must determine in the near future is the question whether there may be a better, more effective and more efficient way of raising an Army and recruiting our military forces than by means of the draft.

Can we, for example, set up such incentives that a volunteer system would provide all the men needed? Or can we depend on a standby draft or some other method yet to be determined? There are many in the services today who prefer the volunteer system.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has proudly announced that his is a volunteer force. General LeMay, in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee, specifically, in answer to my question whether the strength of the Air Force would be affected if the draft were extended for only 1 year, replied that the strength of the Air Force

would not be affected. This is significant testimony.

As some of you may know, I have recently retired from the Army after 33 years of active service. In the light of my experience, I have no hesitation in telling you that there are thousands of American soldiers performing duties completely unrelated to our security effort and contributing nothing to our capability to defend this Nation. Hundreds of men are serving as houseboys, cooks, laundry boys, maids and servants for our senior officers. Other hundreds are being used in jobs of limited military value. In the Pentagon, there are sergeants, on whose training we have spent thousands of dollars, being used as mess boys and waiters. There are a large number of senior noncommissioned officers in the Pentagon who have not worn a uniform of their service for years, but are dressed instead in the neat black suits of chauffeurs.

Very bluntly, Mr. Chairman, I do not want my son or the sons of my constituents to be drafted to serve as a laundry boy or waiter for anyone in the military services.

I am convinced that Congress has the obligation to take a hard, critical look at the utilization of enlisted men in the military services. I believe that after this hard look is taken, this Congress can literally shake out one or two divisions of troops in the Army. I think we can eliminate hundreds of jobs now being performed by enlisted men or convert many of these military billets to civilian jobs.

I am pleased that our distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has established a special subcommittee to study the utilization of military manpower. I am convinced that this subcommittee will come up with recommendations for better utilization of enlisted men in the military services. I am hopeful that this subcommittee will recommend to Congress a more effective and more efficient method than the draft for recruiting the men we need to defend our Nation.

I feel that our main concern at this point is not whether the draft should be extended for 2 years or for 4 years, we know it must be extended. Our real concern, I believe, is whether or not some alternative system, other than the draft, may not be better for the armed services and better for the country.

It is my hope that from the study to be started soon by the special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, there will come recommendations for a better method of recruitment than the military draft. And it is my hope that the Congress will accept the findings of the special subcommittee.

The fact that this study of our military manpower system is being made by this special subcommittee should alert our military leaders to the fact that they cannot lean indefinitely on the crutch of the draft to maintain the necessary manpower level.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the study being initiated by the special subcommittee can make a tremendously important contribution to our national

defense program. It is my hope that from this study there will result a better use of men in the services and a recruitment program that will give us adequate defense forces under a system based on our American principle of equal and fair treatment for all.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks I have received a lot of mail from my constituents and from national religious leaders and others in opposition to the extension of the Draft Act.

Many questions have been raised as to whether better ways are possible in providing for our national defense and security.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is considerable merit to the proposal for a 2-year extension and the selection of a committee to make a thorough study of our Selective Service System.

In the minds of many of our citizens is a belief that under the present draft law there is tremendous waste, not only of money, but of talented youth, who may give more valuable service in our national defense than by serving in the Armed Forces.

Serious thought needs to be given to suggestions to increase military pay and inducements to bring an adequate number of volunteers into our Armed Forces.

These are only a few of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I expect to support the amendment which will be offered for a 2-year extension.

I have profound respect for this committee and its distinguished chairman. I believe that we have little choice but to extend the draft law. But I sincerely believe that these most challenging and dangerous times call for a more thorough study of this crucial issue.

We in the Congress have an obligation to give full and serious deliberation to the effect of this program on the lives of the Nation's young men subject to its provisions.

In the present operation of the military conscription law less than half the young men of draft age actually enter the Armed Forces. There is much waste of manpower and talent. This and other inefficiencies associated with the present system need to be carefully reviewed.

According to the report of the Cordiner Committee, partially implemented by the last Congress, the solution to the personnel problem in the Armed Forces today "is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery, but to give the man already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities."

One of the basic reasons given for supporting the Career Incentive Pay Act last year was that it could eventually eliminate further need for conscription. Controls have always been repulsive in our free society. We accept them only when we must in the national interest.

But now dynamic changes are taking place in military concepts and strategy.

Reason, good sense, and sound judgment call for a most careful and thorough study of the whole question.

A logical approach to this problem is to renew the draft law for 2 years, and to establish a special Commission to study all of the aspects of the military manpower problem.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the way to a stronger Nation, not only in a military way, but morally and economically, and in winning the respect of the free world.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is always a difficult decision to oppose the distinguished and experienced gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. The Navy and the Defense Departments have benefited from his guidance for many years. So it is with profound reluctance that I find myself in agreement with the powerful argument of my colleague from Iowa [Mr. WOLF]. The inadequacies, the extravagant waste and cost, the favoritism and discrimination in favor of those able to go to college, the strain put upon those seeking jobs but subject to the draft, the proven inability of those drafted to see any desirable future in the Armed Forces, the many claims of poor training even while in service, all these and more point to loud warning signals. Granting it would be unwise to drop the draft until a satisfactory system of providing military manpower, I see no justification for extending it for more than 2 years. In that time a strenuous effort to find a better way could be undertaken. Extension for 4 years merely means the soul-searching examination will be postponed and the standpatters would be further encouraged. The needs of our national defense are such that it seems a strange argument that we should extend for 4 years an admittedly weak program. We need and must have only the best. This bill postpones the best until it may be too late. The argument that a 2-year extension would be a sign of weakness is not convincing if in the meantime we were making strenuous efforts to get a really sound system in operation. And if the Defense Department can only operate, if it has a 4-year authority, it shows how inflexible and therefore inefficient is that Department. I shall vote for a 2-year extension, if that fails I shall vote for the bill but with the hope that the Armed Services Committee will press for a better system of attaining our military manpower and present it to the House within a year.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2260, both as a very junior member of the Committee on Armed Services and also as one who has been connected for the past 16 years with the Reserve Forces of our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate this bill we are at present in the midst of a great debate that has gone on in the news-

papers and also at the other end of the Capitol on the subject of whether we are today doing enough to build up the Armed Forces and the national defense of the Nation, specifically with regard to missiles, and whether we are doing enough to stay ahead of the Soviet Union in this regard. In fact, as part of this examination, we of the Armed Services Committee have been having the advantage of testimony by the Secretary of Defense on this subject and have been examining him at length. I for one am not sure whether we are doing all that we should be doing. I am not sure whether we are perhaps not incurring too great a risk in the decisions we have made, too great a risk in the great struggle that is going on between the free world and the Soviet Union.

It could well be that as a result of our deliberations the Congress will decide more money should be spent in this area and that greater emphasis should be called for to provide for the necessary defense. How may we, if we are likely to call for a greater expenditure of money to provide for the national defense, expect to get by in providing for that defense with anything less in terms of personal effort, anything less in terms of personal sacrifice? There is no easy way, it seems to me, to peace or strength or freedom.

We hear a great deal about push-button warfare, but no one has yet come forward with any scheme that would eliminate the human individual, no immaculate way to provide for military strength. Some of the great nations in the world's history are no longer great, chiefly the Roman Empire, because they felt that there was some soft or easy or convenient way of remaining strong, and because they were unwilling to make what sacrifices might be needed and to do some of the hard and unpleasant jobs that were required to maintain their strength.

Let us today, Mr. Chairman, not follow down that same easy, tempting, but disastrous path. Let us not call for more billions for the construction of missiles and then give ourselves or the American people the misleading impression that security can be found without effort and hard work on the part of our citizens universally.

I think that there has been an impression given that perhaps service in uniform is something that ought to be avoided. The truth has sometimes been lost sight of that military service ought to be something regarded as a part of citizenship, something that is an opportunity to take part in a greater and a different way in the necessary operations of a free government.

I think sometimes we have been inclined to stress too much the rights of democratic citizens, Mr. Chairman, without recognizing that there is a corresponding responsibility and obligation. I doubt if we could raise the funds that may be necessary to meet the increased effort in missiles and other forms of advanced technology simply through voluntary contributions by the citizens of our Nation. We have taxes and yet, Mr. Chairman, no one has suggested

in this House that because we have compulsory taxes, democracy is going out the window. I think we, as a nation, should recognize there is a great deal to be said for the citizen soldier serving as a part of his citizenship and that it is not necessarily the right way to expect that we can build our strength purely on paid professional mercenaries.

I had the privilege, Mr. Chairman, of sitting in the gallery of this Chamber in August 1941 when this measure was up for its original extension and when the extension, as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] remarked yesterday, carried by a single vote. Nobody will, perhaps, know to what extent that vote may have persuaded the Japanese military war lords to press their surprise attack on our country which materialized some 3 months later, an attack that even then was in the planning stage. Let us join together, Mr. Chairman, in supporting the legislation as it has come from the committee so that when the vote is taken our enemies and also the people of the United States themselves will know that the American people today, no less than in the day when George Washington was at Valley Forge, are not summer soldiers or sunshine patriots, but that we still stand ready and determined to do everything that is necessary to keep us strong and to keep us free.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER].

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues, I speak to you at a time when things so precious dear to us are endangered in the world today. The defense and security of America requires support in a department that could determine our very existence in the days that lie ahead. I refer, fellow Members, to the extension of the Selective Service Act for 4 more years. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have had the privilege of listening to the recommendations of our top leaders who are charged with guiding our military forces. Their comments were of a serious nature and displayed a great concern with our military end-strength and manner of providing adequate manpower which will meet the military needs of this great country. To me, such a decision is of great importance since it affects the lives of thousands of young men aspiring to mold their careers as they so choose. As a former football coach, my entire life has been devoted to guiding and counseling thousands of young men in all phases of life. As a commanding officer of a Reserve unit, I have had the privilege of channeling thousands of young bluejackets into the U.S. Navy. In all my observations, I have found the Military Establishments at a loss when it comes to procuring the number of personnel necessary to perform their assigned tasks, which are so vitally necessary. Possibly, this is due primarily to your responsibility and my responsibility and to all of the military laymen in the United States of America. I say we possibly have not encouraged our youngsters to go into the military as we do

in other fields of endeavor. Therefore, it is my privilege to recommend that we endorse this bill and have the Committee on Armed Services review it every year, and then when we find that it has served its purpose to discontinue it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER].

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express misgivings about this bill; misgivings which I know some of my colleagues share. I know that we agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATON] that we want to show the world, and of course this Nation, that we as a Congress are ready and determined to keep ourselves strong and free. There is no question about that. I do not have any allusions about what will be done today. This bill will pass by a big vote.

I am a member of the Reserves, and have been for many years. I served, as many of you did, in World War II. Like many of you, I have boys who will soon be eligible to be drafted. I am certainly against the 4-year extension. The 2-year extension brings it before us again in 2 years, to make another hard decision to draft boys. That is a hard decision that we ought to face at least every 2 years. I hope it will be only a 2-year extension.

I also have misgivings about the time that was given for public discussion of the draft law this year. I have great respect for the chairman of this committee and for the committee. Perhaps if I had served on the committee and sat there and listened to the testimony these misgivings would not be in my mind. But they are there, and I want to express them. It is interesting to note that four freshmen Congressmen have been expressing their misgivings. They have been almost alone on the floor today in expressing their misgivings. It may be that they need more experience, too. Perhaps they do not realize what is involved. Of course everybody admits that this law has many unfair aspects. We pay doctors and dentists more. They are making sacrifices. Other people are also making sacrifices, doing jobs at less than the market price. The draft is far from universal. It favors boys who can go to school, boys who can afford to get married, boys who can go abroad. But that is not the point. The point is, Is the national security dependent upon the extension of this law? I cannot believe that forcing boys to serve for 2 years is fundamental to our national security. Is this the best use of our defense dollar? What are the feasible alternatives? How can you vote not to have the draft? What would happen if we did not vote to extend the draft? I am sure that the Armed Services Committee would very quickly make arrangements, and that the Defense Department would be up here with testimony on a number of feasible alternatives on what we could do to have a force made up of volunteers, volunteers even as people who work in our civil service are volunteers. What

would we do if we arranged to do away with the draft? The gentleman from Connecticut said that this program should have a hard, critical look. I agree. I hope that a subcommittee will give it this look. I have heard that the subcommittee has many newly elected members on it. I also hope there would be a hard, critical look given by some civilian organizations, made up of persons who are informed and concerned; people who want to see a better method of achieving our military security than by an unfair peacetime conscription.

I intend to cast a vote against this bill because I am not convinced that peacetime conscription is necessary to keep America strong and free. I am convinced that there are more feasible alternatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], which will close the debate on this side.

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include pertinent material.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I think that many of my colleagues have learned during these 12 years that I have been here in Congress that it is not easy for me, because of my beliefs and background, to support a 4-year extension, nor to favor a draft. In view of the very brilliant debate, both for and against the bill, which has already occurred I would not speak if I did not feel a sense of duty to do so. But there are a few thoughts that I wish to express that have not been mentioned quite enough, in my humble opinion. Also a few points that not even yet, been pointed up to position.

Therefore, I will take this brief time to give you, extemporaneously, my viewpoint. As you know, I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I sat in committee during the presentation of this problem to the committee during a week of hearings. Let me say again, I have not felt comfortable to conclude to vote three times previously for the draft. But due consideration of our Nation's survival forced me to. And may I say to you Members who are opposing this on manifestly sincere beliefs in religious principles—I recognize that two or three of you have emphasized that and I think that a couple of Members have sort of implied, although they did not do it in any mean attitude or of disrespect, but they did imply a sort of feeling that maybe members of the Armed Services Committee which submitted this bill for some reason or other, were being bossed or controlled by military thinking and wishes or dictates. May I assure you that the 37 members of the Armed Services Committee are not less dedicated; are not less free of outside control; are not less free of prejudice or bias than are other Members of this House who are not on that committee. And may I also say to you frankly, that I have found that members of the Armed Services Committee are a group of patriotically dedicated men anxious for world

peace just as much as any men in this House. I know some pray for peace with humility and faith. So I speak conclusively myself, as one of those men just as anxious for world peace and just as dedicated to a proposition that, pray God, there shall never be another war. But, Mr. Chairman, may I say to you that having traveled in Europe, in the Black Sea area, and in the Mediterranean area this last summer as I did, having the benefit of being briefed by military personnel at the top level in England, France, and Germany, in Switzerland, in Italy, in Greece, and in Turkey, and in the Mediterranean and Black Sea areas, I came home convinced, even though I did not want to be, that I could not again fail to vote for the extension of the draft if the military declared it again a necessity for our survival. I hoped it would not be for more than 2 years, at most. That was my humble judgment. But I came from that experience last summer in my studies for the Armed Services Committee overseas and the experience before the committee hearings all last week constrains me to now say to you, that I shall vote for the 4-year term. Whenever I find another man disagreeing with me, I thank God I live in a nation which does not let us force him to agree with me.

The word "survival" has not been used in this debate yet today; it has not been mentioned by a single soul. Yet, if I did not believe that we are in a fight in which our very survival is at stake as a free nation, I would not vote for any draft. But that is the sort of world we continue to be in today. We will be for sometime, I fear, you cannot gainsay. I know of no evidence and do not believe you do, from any sincere religious body or any other group, that constrains me to believe that we are not in a cold war, which could become a hot war. Our potential enemy leaves us no choice but to continue to be militarily strong enough to defend.

And we are close to a hot war. I was in a certain part of this difficult world this summer in my official work, where I saw submarine nets stretched across a very, very narrow opening between two great bodies of water; at each end of those indicative and warning nets was a warship of the Turkish nation, a faithful ally and friend, ready to draw closed those submarine nets on a moment's notice. It made me realize how difficult a problem our military and Executive has. If that is not getting about as close to a hot war as any patriotic American wants to get I do not know what is hot. We must not lose the existing cold war. If we do, our very survival is at issue, instantly.

Let me just mention two or three more points that have been referred to by others. The committee hearings have been referred to, at page 35. Under Secretary of the Army Finucane has been quoted, but quoted, only in part. The part of the statement that was read is as follows:

I think your question is an excellent one, sir. Historically, the draft law has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4

years, and we would like simply for conformity sake to carry on with the habits of the past.

That statement has been quoted by three of those who are opposed to this bill and has been relied upon with major relevancy to support their opposition to this bill.

But let me read you the balance on that page, by the Secretary, which none of them read to you:

Actually the Congress can indeed change the law any time it wants to. The Congress is always available in the national interest, and it seems to me that 4 years is a reasonable time.

That is the part of the statement which the three gentlemen should also have read for the information of the House. I believe it would have given us more of the real picture.

One further point which I feel it is appropriate to bring to you here. I am also a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House and have been for several terms. There is no committee in this great body which comes more intimately in touch with the problem of national defense from the angle of subversive cold war than does your Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. May I say I know of no evidence, either in book, pamphlet, or newspaper form nor have I heard any offered here, that indicates to me the conspiracy which was initiated by Lenin and Stalin and continued by Khrushchev has stopped. That conspiracy is dedicated to conquest of the free world. The Soviet has not changed this decision. In fact, it has not abated. With all due respect to the great religious bodies, one of which I am a member of, and proud of it, one of the great mistakes some of those great religious bodies make is that sometimes they are anticipating, through their hopes and through their earnest prayers, that the world now is ready for us to expect world peace from the Soviets. I grant that would peace is the natural hope of all thinking persons, true, but there never can be a safe approach by us to a bona fide world peace with only one party, and that our Nation, wanting world peace. And the Soviets are not asking for world peace except on their terms. They demand we negotiate on their terms.

I learn of enough actual instances in the last 12 months which, I believe, ought to convince any reasonable man that the Soviets are deliberately trying to set up incidents which will make it impossible for a just and fair world peace, except on their terms. Just the other day the Soviets gave notice they would demand to retain the right of veto to any agreement on disarmaments. What does that mean if it does not mean that they want to continue the upper hand and power in all negotiations? Peace will only come between nations dedicated to it and controlled by utmost good faith at all times.

I feel I cannot now do less than to remind you, that the reason we need this 4-year extension, in my judgment, or one of the reasons, is that we are in a cold war which is ever present and you know it. Why, then, take a chance of

weakening the military strength which we all know is not only necessary as a deterrent, but it is our survival that is involved. That is why I am for this extension. It is our survival that is involved, and we cannot survive if we cannot deter; and we cannot survive if we cannot win a world peace founded on mutual good faith. Winning means not only for our own sake, may I say, not only for our own sake, but we must recognize that we are the leaders in the free world community. We cannot safely change that relationship to our allies.

I saw on my trip some conditions which shocked me when I realized, for instance, that over there thousands of our American boys are on guard 24 hours a day. They are on guard for us here today. I saw them, I was with them. They are on the alert for all free peoples. What are they on the alert for? Do you think it is unnecessary? Do you think it is unsound for the American Air Force and Navy to be on the alert over there for 24 hours a day? I was with the Sixth Fleet for several days, and they were on the alert 24 hours a day also. We must not weaken their support—not one iota.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that a special subcommittee of our committee has already been appointed in connection with this study and that subcommittee will bring in a report before many months. Certainly that report should come in before a year.

I believe my Nation's security and the security of the free world dictates to us to vote for this bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services. Our survival is at stake.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California a minute ago spoke of the special subcommittee investigating the manpower needs of this country. Could we have some idea as to when the chairman envisions a report from this committee?

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the gentleman and for the benefit of the House that after consultation with various Members and particularly with some of our new colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services the other day, I was authorized to name a subcommittee, and this was the jurisdiction:

Said subcommittee shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry of all phases of defense manpower utilization, including but not limited to, military and civilian personnel, tables of organization, the utilization of technically trained personnel in technical positions, the extent to which military personnel are assigned to civilian-type duties, the utilization of military personnel to provide personal services to other military personnel, a determination as to whether additional combat organizations may be created by more efficient utilization and without increasing the total strength of the military forces, and such other matters as may be pertinent to any of the foregoing;

That the subcommittee shall meet at such times as may be designated by the chairman thereof.

Now, it was our objective to confer authority upon this subcommittee to take into consideration the whole manpower subject matter. So, I designated the distinguished member of our committee who is also a member of the Democratic caucus, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MELVIN PRICE, as chairman; Mr. LEROY H. ANDERSON, Mr. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Mr. FRANK KOWALSKI, Mr. FRED WAMPLER, Mr. SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Mr. JEFFERY COHELAN, and for the minority our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. GUBSER, and Mr. BECKER. These gentlemen will make this inquiry that you make reference to.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I will certainly yield to your better judgment and support this legislation, but I am hopeful that this special committee is going to come out with a report and recommendation as quickly as possible, and if there is a better way of obtaining the young men that our Armed Forces need; better than the way we are prescribing today, I certainly hope they will bring it up.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am voting for this legislation with a heavy heart and with great misgivings. I just completed, before I came to the Congress, a very intensive survey in Chicago on teenage gangs and juvenile delinquency, and I find that the draft has a very important effect on the present development of our young people. Every youngster in my city between the ages of 18 and 26 has to register for the draft. This means that hundreds of thousands of youngsters are forced to live in a shadow of constant doubt as to their future when actually only a few thousands are ultimately drafted. This uncertainty that these young people are constantly faced with makes it virtually impossible for them to plan their future in an orderly manner. The most tragic aspect of this situation is that many young men who graduate from high school and who do not, or cannot because of economic reasons, go to college find it impossible to get decent employment because the first thing they are asked by a potential employer is what is his draft status. The moment a youngster admits that he is eligible for the draft he is either given the lowest type of employment or, as is the case in many instances, flatly denied employment. This tragic condition cannot be permitted to continue and we must provide some program for those youngsters who are under the shadow of the draft, but are never called, to be permitted to adjust their lives in an orderly manner. I could not begin to tell you the hardships that this situation is causing to thousands of youngsters who are not seeking a way to shirk responsibility but, who, because of the cumbersome mechanics of the draft, are involuntarily plunged into this pool of teenage idleness. So I am really hopeful that this committee will come up with some recommendations very quickly.

Mr. VINSON. I feel confident, I will say to my friend from Illinois, that some worthwhile accomplishments will be the result of this investigation by this com-

mittee, because it is staffed with very able, qualified men.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How long will it take?

Mr. VINSON. I am hoping they will finish their work—I cannot name any time—between now and midsummer. They should be able to finish their work in that time.

Mr. Chairman, there is no further request for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WINSTEAD: On page 1, line 6, immediately before the period insert the following: "and by adding at the end thereof the following proviso: 'Provided, That no person inducted under the provisions of this Act shall be compelled to bear arms against any citizen or citizens of the United States except in case of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress'."

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. The argument for this whole act is to be prepared to fight a foreign enemy or to prevent a global war. It is very limited, as we all know, as to the number of people that will be inducted under the provisions of this act. All this amendment does is simply this, in simple language. It says that no young man inducted under the provisions of this act shall be sent into a community on a limited, local disturbance, unless we have a war or a national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

We give conscientious objectors the right to refuse any service whatsoever. I should like to point out to you that the provisions of this bill do one thing. Suppose you have a labor disturbance in any State of this Union. Suppose you are in a mining area, and on this limited basis we draft the son of a miner. We bring him into the service on the premise that it is to protect this country against a foreign foe. Let us assume further that a strike should develop and get out of hand, and that Federal troops should be sent into that community. I do not believe a Member of this House would consider it to be right that a local boy be ordered into his home community to bear arms against his own people. I submit to you that is the only purpose of this amendment: That we give the same consideration to those we induct as you would give to conscientious objectors who refused any service whatsoever.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. May I ask the gentleman how his amendment to this proposed legislation squares up with the

Formosa resolution passed by the Congress and the Middle East resolution that was passed by the Congress, both almost unanimously? How does his amendment square up with those two resolutions?

Mr. WINSTEAD. It does not affect those two at all. This deals solely with local situations.

Mr. BECKER. Those principles deal with local situations.

Mr. WINSTEAD. But this deals with local situations within our own borders, dealing with our own people, not with foreign matters. Keep this in mind: that this amendment does not bar anyone from going unless it is against his honest convictions. A person inducted under selective service, certainly should not be sent into his home area against his own people or against his own conscientious beliefs.

I hope that the membership of this body will pass judgment on this amendment exclusively on its own merits, and without regard for political or other alien considerations. If it can be considered objectively and in the light of fairness, I am confident that it will be adopted unanimously. Surely no Member of this House would vote to deprive a patriotic American soldier, willing to fight in defense of this great Nation, the privilege of being relieved from the duty of having to bear arms against his father, his brother, his family, and his friends. I do not believe there is a Member in this House who will turn down this provision if it is understood what I am sincerely and honestly trying to do with this amendment. I think it is fair.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Would this amendment have prevented President Eisenhower from sending in the guard in Arkansas?

Mr. WINSTEAD. This does not affect the guard whatsoever. This would not have prevented President Eisenhower from sending the First Airborne Division into Little Rock. But it would have given to the son of a man in Little Rock, Ark., the right to say, "Don't send me back home to point guns and bayonets at my own people." Who wants to deny that individual that privilege? It is merely a concession to right and decency. If you want to ease tension in this country and if you want to allay strife rather than promote it, you will give serious consideration to this amendment on its merits and on the basis on which it has been submitted to you.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from Mississippi has mentioned the coal mining region. Let me remind the gentleman that in 1921 the Army was sent into West Virginia to quell an armed march of miners. They arrested the leader of the miners. Instead of following the constitutional provision that a man should be given a speedy trial in the district in which the crime was committed, they took him across to Charles-

ton, W. Va., and tried the leaders of the miners' march in the same courtroom where they convicted John Brown of treason; and they convicted one of the mine leaders of treason. Among the miners they tried was a minister of the gospel, and he got a stiff sentence. He was not tried before a jury of his peers, but before a three-judge Federal court setup.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia. Will the gentleman not agree with me that the son of one of those miners should not be sent into his home and local community against his own people? My friends, that is all that this amendment does. I hope you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] be recognized for the Committee on Armed Services.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, frequently we hear complaints about the executive or the judicial branch of the Government infringing on the legislative powers of the Congress. I have agreed on many of those complaints, but I do not see how you can very well claim that other branches should not infringe upon the congressional powers and, yet, be willing lightly to infringe upon the executive powers. Nothing can be clearer than that the Congress has the power to raise and support armies and to provide a Navy. Nor can anything be clearer than once raised, they pass under the control of the President as Commander in Chief for deployment orders here, there, and everywhere.

In addition to that, the language of this amendment is such that no one could ever understand what could happen under it. Let us consider, for instance, a man who serves, say, for 2 years and still has his Reserve obligation and goes into the National Guard of his State to serve. Of course, the Governor has command of his National Guard for the purpose of putting down civil commotion. Where will that man be under the provisions of this amendment? Because he has been inducted, you understand for a 2-year period, and then in turn, because of the additional Reserve obligation, goes into the National Guard of his State for the purpose of discharging that obligation.

This amendment reads: "That no person inducted under the provisions of this act shall be compelled to bear arms against any citizen or citizens of the United States."

In addition to that, where would you be in the event of insurrection in the United States—by American citizens? But insurrection nevertheless—with provisions in our statutes for the President, and he has the right and, of course, he has the constitutional obligation to put down insurrection. There are statutes defining the manner in which he may do it—with the Regular Army or with the National Guard. So where would

these people be? You would be demobilizing the very people who would be in a position to put down insurrection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The gentleman spoke of the National Guardsman when he comes to the National Guard. I do not know how it is in all the States of the Union, but the Adjutant General of my State says that he never, when they are called out for any disturbance within the State, sends a local boy into his own home or local community. I do not believe the President of the United States should do so either.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I only have 5 minutes, and the gentleman had his 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the point is that under the language of the gentleman's amendment, it is provided that no person inducted hereunder shall be assigned to this type of duty, and the man who is inducted and then enters the National Guard is a man who has been inducted. He is serving a compulsory tour in the National Guard, under an act of Congress, to discharge his Reserve obligation. So that you are setting up here a matter of proscribing the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army, and of the Governor as commander of the State militia. You leave them powerless in the event of a civil disturbance or insurrection in the United States. This is not something to take lightly. I do not agree with all that was done at Little Rock. Some of the implications are greater than have ever been brought out, but this is no time to tie the hands of the President on the question of an insurrection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Furthermore, you know that every man who serves a 2-year tenure of duty does not go into the National Guard unless he volunteers and is accepted. He is not forced under any induction procedure to serve in the National Guard.

Mr. KILDAY. But once he makes that election he is obligated to serve. He is a man who was inducted.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Do you believe for a minute that any National Guardsman would be involved as you discuss this? What I am trying to do is to give a man who has a conscientious conviction—

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know how you are going to have a military organization with men deciding that they have conscientious objections. If you are going to have a military organization of any kind, whether National Guard or Reserves, or what not, the first thing he is going to have to do is to take orders.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] because it is in keeping not only with the stated purpose of the Selective Service and Training Act but is also in keeping with the safeguards of national security. The purpose of this amend-

ment, as stated by its author, is to insure that the Armed Forces of the United States will be used in the defense of this country and in defense of our national security and to specifically insure that persons inducted under the provisions of this act will not under any circumstances be called upon to bear arms against American citizens.

One of the most tragic incidents in the history of our Nation was the use of elements of the 101st Airborne Division to patrol the classrooms, corridors, and grounds of Central High School in Little Rock, Ark., and to draw bayonets and other weapons against unoffending high school boys and girls. There can be no relation, real or imagined, between our national security and the use of armed force and Army troops against teenage students.

The statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that this amendment if adopted would preclude the Governor of a State from using National Guard units to quell domestic disorders, riots, or actions which cannot be quelled by police units are not quite accurate. The gentleman knows that neither enlisted men nor officers of the National Guard of any of the States are inducted into the National Guard under the provisions of this act. The filling of vacancies in all ranks of the National Guard is by voluntary enlistment, and there is no provision in Federal or State law for induction into National Guard units under the law which presently prevails.

It is a well-known fact that many chief executives of various States abide by a firm rule not to call out National Guard units for domestic duty, riot, or otherwise, in the locality in which such National Guard unit is normally and regularly stationed. This is a good rule and one which is almost universally followed. The same principle which is embodied in this rule exists in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

This amendment would place emphasis where emphasis should be placed, and that is on the security and defense of the United States of America, and it would clearly provide that any person inducted under provisions of this act shall not be compelled to bear arms against any American citizen except in time of war or in time of an emergency hereinafter specifically declared by the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WINSTEAD), there were—ayes 42, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: On page 1, line 6, delete the word "July 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1961".

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have three other exactly similar amendments. I ask that all four amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, delete "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1961".

Page 2, line 6, delete "July 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1961".

Page 2, line 10, delete "1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1, 1961."

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, as I stand before you in support of my amendment I have standing with me in this position the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the AFL-CIO, important church groups, and some very distinguished Americans many of whom are sitting with me here today in this Chamber.

Again, as I see it, the question is whether it is better to extend this act for 4 years or to extend it for 2 years, review and renew if need be at that time. Or should Congress just casually stand by and give?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] referred to page 38. I would like to acknowledge to the gentleman from Texas, that I too referred to that page. I think it proves my case for 2 years. I was in error slightly in some of my figures, sir, but the statistics shown here I think bear out my contention. And without belaboring everyone who has studied this and reached a different opinion I am going to repeat the statement that each year since they began to create more fringe benefits the percentage of reenlistments has improved. So I think this fact makes a case for my stand on improving the incentives for reenlistment.

I would like to point out something else in the testimony, and may I say to the Members I think it is very much worth their consideration, a little exchange between one of the members of the committee and Gen. Curtis LeMay of the Air Force. I think this testimony is worthy of your serious consideration. A member of the committee asked this question:

With regard to your observation about how soon you felt the effective end of a nuclear war would come—2 or 3 days—it is not your opinion that the war would actually end within 2 or 3 days?

And General LeMay answered:

I said the decisive phase. There may be some fighting, mopping up and things of that sort. But the decision will have been rendered by that time.

If the serious phase of a future war may last only a few days, cannot Congress afford to take a look every 2 years at this matter of extending the draft?

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] quoted much of Mr. Finucane's testimony. I would like to read what he quoted again. He said:

I think your question is an excellent one, sir. Historically, the draft law has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years, and we would like simply for conformity sake to carry on with the habits of the past.

Actually, the Congress can, indeed, change the law any time it wants. The Congress is always available in the national interest. And it seems to me that 4 years is a reasonable time. If the Congress desired to change the law 2 years from now or 1 year from now, or at any time, it would be, of course, perfectly within its rights and prerogatives.

I think Mr. Finucane makes my case eloquently well. Congress has the power to extend the draft for any length of time.

So, why not let us vote for 2 years for the draft and then review it, and, if we need to, vote it again.

I am happy, too, that the Armed Services Committee has in its wisdom appointed this study committee. I think it is a step in the right direction. I am happy that it has done so and I hope that this study committee, as has been suggested, will report back in a year, and then in 2 years we can make our decision again regarding the draft.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say I have considerable support for the 2-year extension here on the floor.

If there are no questions, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not stand for the purpose of asking for time. It was my intention to vote for at least one part of the amendments if we could get a separate vote, but I understand they have been offered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments were offered en bloc.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate over extension of the Selective Service and reviewed the material that has come to my desk, and read the letters, and they have all been on one side—in opposition—I find the following arguments being used in opposition and I would like briefly to summarize the matter as I have seen it:

First. The present draft does not pay the recruit an adequate wage. It demands his compulsory contribution without adequate compensation; yet it results in a very expensive and very wasteful use of manpower;

Second. The draft has not in fact been universal and has operated unfairly

in its demands upon the young generation;

Third. It is not related to the needs of modern warfare, which calls for more highly trained technicians than even a 2-year, much less a 6-month, program can achieve;

Fourth. As a result it creates an illusion of strength through numbers rather than the reality of strength through skills, morale, and organization;

Fifth. It is a continued invasion of the rights of privacy of American citizens. It is alien to our historical tradition; indeed, many of America's settlers were people who came here to escape the militarization of European countries;

Sixth. It interrupts the educational program and planning for a career, or marriage and family, of the younger generation, and thus ultimately weakens the real security and strength of our Nation;

Seventh. Perpetuation of the draft endorses the present negative and unimaginative military and foreign policy of the administration. It admits failure to believe that we can move toward reconciliation of international differences and learn how to live together. It assumes we must concentrate on co-extinction rather than coexistence;

Eighth. It extends the military influence on American life contrary to our constitutional intent to maintain civil dominance over the military;

Ninth. The program was originally defended as a means for buying time. The theory originally was that we would use this time to develop peaceful alternatives.

Time is running out; extension of the draft may be a desperate gamble, causing us to forget that "time is running against us," as General Bradley said, "with the speed of a sputnik."

Tenth. The consequence of all these factors is that our society offers a poor motivation for young men to accept military service without compulsion, or, at least, so argue those favoring extension of the draft. However, a voluntary military establishment whose basic cadre included those making an extended stay, if not a career of military service, would provide us with the kind of personnel that modern methods of defense require. Such volunteers would have better motivation and would do a better job. They could be secured by a change in manpower personnel practices such as the following: (a) Better pay for recruits; (b) a better program to hold reservists; (c) greater use of civilians for support-type activities of transportation, housing, food, and so forth; (d) more widespread use of local support, including nationals at overseas bases for the nonmilitary activities. This type of program would at the same time serve to reduce our total manpower requirements and make the activities of those who served more significant and meaningful.

Eleventh. It is time that the Nation challenge its youth not merely to learn how to launch an intercontinental ballistic missile that will mean the end of civilization, but instead challenge its youth to enlist for peace, to volunteer for peace-building activity the world

around. The Nation ought to be planning to wage war on man's ancient enemies, which are disease, hunger, misery, and poverty. For this is the only war in which all mankind can be victorious.

For all of these reasons I must oppose the present 4-year extension of the draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, with the greatest reluctance, I shall vote for the extension of the draft.

I recognize the unpleasant practicalities of the situation. I seriously question whether the manpower necessary to meet and maintain our defense commitments can otherwise be assured.

It is one thing to wish devoutly that it were otherwise—to wish that those commitments were not necessary or, being necessary, that they could be met on a strictly voluntary basis. It is quite another to default on the commitments.

To say that I do not concur in all of those commitments does not alter the fact that once made by due process of legislative and executive decision they must be fulfilled.

I oppose with all my vigor any suggestion or proposal that the draft be used for purposes of enforcing an alleged obligation of service other than of a strictly military nature. I want no part of such a totalitarian program.

I do believe that the extension ought to be limited to 2 years to correspond to the life and tenure of the Congress. If the constitutional purpose of a biennial election of the entire House and one-third of the Members of the other body is to be served, legislation of this character, in my judgment, should be subject to mandatory review by the next Congress. I do not believe that this Congress should usurp the responsibility of the succeeding Congress.

But here again, the hard practicalities of the situation require that I accept, however reluctantly, the verdict of the majority.

On one count I am particularly disturbed and distressed. The fact that the legislation here proposed to be re-enacted commits American servicemen by compulsion to duty in foreign lands where their constitutional safeguards are abrogated under the status-of-forces agreements is to me totally repugnant. Yet the responsibility for this situation lies basically in the failure of Congress to address itself specifically and forthrightly to that problem. I cannot permit one wrong to be compounded by a second wrong on the fatuous theory that a right is thereby accomplished.

With these profound and disturbing reservations, I shall again, as I did 4 years ago, vote for the extension of the draft.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, failure to extend the draft will have a serious impact on the Reserves. I propose

to discuss its impact in three broad areas:

First, the effects on maintenance of adequate strength;

Second, the effects on maintenance of adequate quality; and

Third, the effects on maintenance of proper training participation.

Failure to extend the draft will result in serious strength deficiencies for both officer and enlisted programs in all the services. College-orientated officer procurement programs, such as ROTC, the Naval Reserve officer candidate program and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class are principal sources of officers for both the Active and Reserve Forces.

It is quite obvious that many young men join these programs in lieu of being inducted. Following completion of active duty, these officers fulfill the balance of their military obligation in the Reserve. In the case of the Army ROTC, many officers take 6 months' active duty for training after commissioning, and fulfill the remainder of their obligation in the Reserve.

In addition to the serious effects on Reserve officer strength, there would also be a damaging effect on Reserve strength in enlisted ranks. Six-month-active-duty-for-training programs, with the balance of the obligation fulfilled in the Reserve, are an important source of enlisted Reserves. An additional direct Reserve enlistment program for 6 years requires 2 years of active duty with the balance in the Reserve. There is no doubt that entrants into all of these programs are draft inspired. Finally, in the case of the Army, the inductee is the principal source of full trained manpower in the Reserve after completion of his 2-year term of active duty.

The Army has estimated that without the draft authority, there would be a deficit of 103,000 within the units for the Army Reserve by the end of fiscal year 1963. This deficit is from an overall requirement of 247,000 and would, therefore, represent a deficiency of 45 percent. Of even greater significance is the estimated deficiency in strength within the enlisted reinforcement pool of the Army Reserve. Without the draft, it is estimated that there would be a deficit of 653,000 by the end of fiscal year 1963 to meet a total requirement of 895,000 in the reinforcement pool. Although estimates have not been made for the other services, they too would have serious strength deficiencies for both units and reinforcements.

Not only would the loss of draft authority jeopardize total Reserve strength, but there would be a loss in quality. With the resulting reduction in applicants for the Reserve officer programs, selectivity and quality would suffer. In the case of enlisted programs, it is probable that the services would have to abandon the requirement of a short period of initial active duty for training in the case of nonprior enlistees into the Reserve. This would mean that the Reserves would have to revert to conducting recruit training in the armories which would make it impossible for the Reserves to meet the readiness goals re-

quired by modern concepts. Furthermore, with the depletion of enlisted personnel who enter the Reserve after 2 years of active duty, the quality of Reserves would be further compromised. Such individuals form the hard core of leadership and technical skills in the Reserve.

A final effect can be anticipated in training participation. Not only does the draft authority provide stimulus for entrance into programs which require 6 months' active duty for training, but it also insures participation in Reserve training of the individuals concerned after they have completed this initial period of active duty for training. Under the law, persons in these programs who do not participate satisfactorily in Reserve training are reported to selective service for priority induction; 2,879 such individuals were reported for priority induction in fiscal year 1958.

In summary, failure to extend the draft authority will have a damaging effect on the Reserves in respect to the maintenance of adequate strengths, quality, and training participation. It will, therefore, tend to seriously impair mobilization readiness.

(Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. DURIAM) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. WHITENER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on behalf of the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa. I think the record will show conclusively that I have been a consistent advocate of a strong and balanced Military Establishment. My position is unchanged. It is, in fact, because of this very concern for the defense of the Nation that I have developed serious doubts about the quality of our present draft system. I will vote for the Wolf amendment because I believe it is necessary to extend the present system until a better one can be devised; but I believe it is important that we use those 2 years to reformulate our thinking and policies on this important matter.

One would expect that the administration, charged with the responsibility of maintaining strong and efficient Armed Forces, would come up with some new ideas in this field, but the administration is following its usual policy of drifting along with events rather than leading them. It is therefore necessary that Congress serve notice that this extension is temporary—for 2 years—and that this time will be used by Congress to formulate new policies and concepts.

There are many specific complaints, but in general terms the fundamental questions which are being raised about the present draft system are the following:

First. Is it the best method of supplying the necessary manpower for our Armed Forces or are there alternatives which would better serve this function?

Second. Does it produce an adequate Reserve Force or does it generate an

enormous, expensive, and inefficient Reserve program?

Third. Is it unnecessarily costly?

Fourth. Is it fair to the Nation's youth, or is it unnecessarily arbitrary, discriminatory, and conducive to legal but demeaning draft dodging?

Each of these general questions involves a host of specific ones.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to have the answers to these questions, but there is a growing feeling in Congress and in the Nation that the answers are distinctly not flattering to our present draft system. They need and deserve serious investigation by Congress, and, meanwhile, I see no reason for extending this dubious system for more than 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say, as a former majority leader, that it has been my responsibility to take the lead in the extension of the Draft Act heretofore, and that I have done. I am supporting the measure here today, and I trust this amendment will be defeated. The fact that we extend the authority for 4 years does not mean that it is not constantly within the province of the Congress of the United States to make any change that might seem to be indicated at any given time.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, what the gentleman from Indiana says is perfectly true. Funds must be appropriated every year to cover the number of men who are to be in the military service, and by the simple matter of failing to appropriate funds to maintain the larger force you can automatically terminate it each year.

Mr. Chairman, I would propound this question. Is there any Member of this floor who can seriously and conscientiously say to himself that he knows of anything in the present difficult situation that would lead him to believe or even suspect that our international situation will have eased by 1961? Is there anything in the present world situation that could cause us to believe that? Now, it is true that the Congress at one time had that sincere hope. In 1940 we passed the original Training and Service Act, and it was effective for a period of 5 years. In May 1945, with victory coming in Europe and anticipated in Japan, we extended it for 1 year. Then we extended it for 1½ months. That, of course, was to get over the period during which we were working on it. Then when we did finish working on it we extended it for only 9 months. Then we were so optimistic about the world situation that we permitted it to die in 1947.

But in 1948, we found it necessary to reenact it to revive the draft, and we did it for a period of 2 years. Then we had a 15-day extension at the end of those 2 years, to have a new conference on the bill. When we had completed that, we extended it for 1 year. But by 1951 Korea had come on and it was so evident to all that you did not have the prospect, in the immediate future, of any improvement in the world condition that Congress extended it for a period of 4 years. When that 4 years expired in 1955 it was extended for a period of 4 years, and will expire in 1959.

So our experience has shown that we are in a cold-war period, apparently of indefinite duration. Should we send out word that the Congress of the United States has refused to extend inductions under the draft for a period in excess of 2 years? Would you not be going right in accordance with what Mikoyan said when he returned to Moscow in attempting to drive a wedge between the American people and the American Government, that the American people now, as reflected by the Congress of the United States, had refused to extend the draft for 4 years, as had been done in two previous instances, but had determined to terminate it at an earlier date? Would we not be saying to those nations whose cooperation we expect that we have now become weary and that for a period of only 2 years will we make an effort to maintain the military force deemed adequate?

But the most important thing about reducing this to 2 years, and the thing that would be most unfortunate, would be to hold out to the young man who is subject to induction under the law that in a matter of 2 years the danger of his induction will have subsided, that it will no longer exist, because the Congress has said that only for a period of 2 more years is there danger of his being inducted. You lull him into a sense of false security, that it is only a matter of 2 years. I do not believe I have heard anyone here state that he believes seriously and conscientiously thinks that in 1961 there will be any better opportunity to terminate it than now.

If there is an extension of a period of 2 years only, what will happen to your voluntary enlistments? Of course we hear the great boasts of the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps that they are made up of volunteers only, but experience has shown that without the compulsion on entering the military service those who now rely on volunteering would have a very, very difficult time in securing their volunteer force. I do not recall one word from any of those services before our committee that they could maintain a voluntary force of the present size if it were not for the compulsion which exists because of this induction.

Should you reduce this to a period of 2 years you will be upsetting what the program must be. It must continue further than 1961. You are leading the Russians to believe we have wearied. You are leading those who cooperate with us to draw the same conclusion. You are attempting to disillusion the young men of the United States, to

whom you would hold out here a false hope that they were not going to be subject to the draft after a period of 2 years.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. IRWIN. Will what the gentleman says suggest you are holding out a false hope 4 years from now?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I do not think so. I take the position that this is probably an indefinite period of time. I am very sorry to say that but I really believe that it is. The side is going to win the cold war which has the stamina to remain strong throughout. When you are dealing with things of this kind, once you become weak that is when they are going to pounce on you. For two consecutive times the extension has been for a period of 4 years. Ever since we got rid of the fool's paradise in which we were living when we permitted our Armed Forces at the end of World War II to disintegrate it has been the policy to extend it for a period of 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as this debate now comes to a close on this most important bill, I would like most sincerely and respectfully to say to all my colleagues that while some may have differences of opinion as to what might have been, or should be embodied in this bill, and that while the bill may not be as each of us desire in its entirety, I am sure it will have your approval. I know each and every one of you to be a loyal, sincere American. You want to do what is best for the country. I sincerely hope this afternoon that when the final rollcall is had on this bill that we can come up with practically a unanimous vote. Why do I so earnestly hope for such a result? Because today every free nation in the world is watching what we do on this vitally important defense measure. Our final decision on the passage of this bill will have a great impact on the free peoples of every nation throughout the world. An affirmative, strong vote here today strengthens the will of the peoples of our allies who want to continue to be free and the will of those who are striving for freedom. On this defense measure the military leaders of this country and the leaders in the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle are in agreement. I emphasize we are acting upon a measure on which there is unanimous agreement on the part of our military leaders. We are also acting with unity, with complete agreement on both sides of the political aisle. We are acting on a measure reported by the Committee on Armed Services which year after year so diligently studies these matters, and has the responsibility of knowing our defense needs.

So by overwhelmingly passing this bill we are sending word to the people of the world that we stand together as a united people to maintain a strong military posture. We reassure the free people of the

world that there is hope. By our action here today we say to any possible aggressor nation that we have, and are determined to have now and in the future, the military strength to deter any aggression. Four years ago on February 8, 1955, to be exact, we had this same matter before us. On the rollcall vote we had 394 in favor of the 4-year extension of the draft and only 4 against. I hope we will be as emphatic on this vote today.

Secretary of State Dulles is presently overseas to deal with the troublesome problem with respect to the city of Berlin. When the news of the favorable action of the Congress on this bill reaches him, he will have definite evidence to reassure all the free nations of the world of our determination to cooperate for the survival of the free peoples of the world. I hope we have a decisive vote for this measure. Our national security, our ability to defend ourselves—freedom itself is at stake.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and I hope that if Secretary of State Dulles boasts while he is in Europe about how Congress has extended conscription in this country for 4 years, that he in all fairness calls upon foreign governments to stop reducing the obligated service of their conscripts.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] spoke of the renewal of the draft just before the war in Korea. Yes, conscription was renewed at that time and, exclusive of South Koreans, Americans did 95 percent of the fighting and dying and all the financing of that war.

Where were those so-called allies in the United Nations when that brutal war was being fought? Not a single other country provided more than a comparative handful of combat troops. Are these free world friends really interested in stopping Communist aggression?

Time after time today it has been stated on the floor of the House that conscription of American boys must be continued in order to make some kind of an impression on foreigners. It is time, it seems to me, that they made some impression upon us other than to take everything that is not nailed down.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported extensions of the draft in the past and would support an extension of 2 years today. What is wrong with Congress having the opportunity to review this legislation every 2 years, dealing as it does with the lives and fortunes of thousands of our young men?

I cannot support a 4-year extension.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, of course it is all right to vest authority in those charged with our national defense, but it might be well to put some restrictions on that authority. That statement is made because many of us have a distinct recollection of the time when General Hershey, as he is now, was charged with the enforcement of the law.

The Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, wrote into the resolution certain exemptions with reference to agricultural workers. General Hershey paid no attention to that exemption. Take a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of February 5, 1945, page 831; February 27, 1945, page 1503; May 4, 1945, page A2098; and October 22, 1945, page 9914, which should be sufficient to show the then situation. If you will look back you will find that the district now represented by Mr. MEADER, the district then represented by Mr. MICHENER called the attention of the House to the fact that General Hershey and his subordinates charged with the interpretation of that law or the application of it, went into the State of Michigan and directed the draft boards in Michigan to disregard the amendment. It is all right. We may need this kind of legislation, but if we are going to let individual officers in the Armed Services follow the course of the Supreme Court and substitute their ideas as to what the Congress meant when it wrote the legislation in place of what we said or wrote there is nothing I can do about it. Give some a little authority they follow their own thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out the "repealed" and insert "amended by striking out the words 'July 1, 1959' and inserting the words 'July 1, 1963' in place thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that adequate consideration was not accorded in the hearings to voluntary alternatives to the draft or even to programs to insure improved training and utilization of military manpower required by the problems of the space age.

I respectfully submit that these training and utilization problems should have been considered and settled by the Congress before the extension of the draft. Certainly our committee should have been briefed by the Secretary of Defense and departmental experts before the draft bill was considered.

Thus, the proposal is in a sense a sort of legislative and parliamentary weightlessness—the labored application of 19th century, Prussianized, military techniques to the incredibly complex, technical and scientific problems of the nuclear, space age.

It is clear to most thinking people, I believe, that ordinary draftees are not performing, and cannot adequately perform, the extremely technical tasks of the Armed Forces in this missile age.

Highly trained personnel are required today. They must not only undergo long, intensive training and practice and be of a high order of intelligence, but they must be willing to make the services their career. They must be a scientifically and technically trained professional force—able to master the intricate techniques that have become absolutely essential to our defense setup.

We need more highly trained technologists at Cape Canaveral and similar bases and in all related advanced defense work. While men will be necessary in the mass for conventional defense operations, the primary need today is for highly trained specialists, and I do not believe these men can be secured in sufficient numbers and quality under the draft as it is currently operated.

We all recognize the fact that only the Army needs or employs the draft today, that the draft is disrupting the lives and education of all young men, that it works grave inequities on many, that in peacetime it is inconsistent with our free institutions, that it is not producing the kind of permanent career, professionalized specialists we need in the space age.

I agree that, to an extent not precisely evaluated and perhaps overemphasized, the draft may stimulate enlistment in the Navy, Air Force and Marines. But there is no evidence that it stimulates reenlistment; the opposite is the case, it does not.

But the fact remains that we have not adequately explored the enlistment-producing alternatives of radically revising our manpower procurement and training methods, stepping up the incentives by appropriate pay readjustments and driving ahead with a broad, bold campaign in the schools, colleges, laboratories, factories, on the farms and byways of the Nation to attract more capable, ambitious young men into career opportunities in the armed services and to train them as they should be trained these days.

We might also carefully explore the possibilities of inaugurating training programs that would not involve taking young men away from their schools, their jobs, and their families—local area and community programs that would embrace intensive training in related military fields with special emphasis upon scientific and technological requirements that would appropriately meet our need for well trained specialists and their proper assignment and utilization.

I cannot understand why Congress should extend the draft until these vital questions have been most carefully studied and discussed. Certainly to extend it for 4 years would be unsound and unrealistic.

Nor can I in any event understand why this Congress should be asked to extend this system with all its admitted infirmities for another long, 4-year period without first making some effort to correct the plain, palpable shortcomings, weaknesses and inadequacies which we all know exist in the draft system.

For a long time to come we will need sizable and substantial conventional forces and weaponry. The foot soldier with his small arms and rifle still has,

and will have, an important place in our defense, civil defense and domestic, and oversea forces.

But it is a great mistake, it could be a fatal mistake, to try to train our Armed Forces in conventional systems alone, as is being done to such a large extent with draftees at present.

The Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, various Reserves and the National Guard comprise our ready, or nearly ready, manpower force. We must have them in sufficient numbers. I urge that they should be organized and trained along modern lines, following modern concepts.

National conscription and the draft based on compulsion and sheer mass strength, while suitable in 19th-century warfare, cannot be adequate or effective in peacetime defense in this day and age.

If we are to survive in the tough, competitive race in which we are engaged, we must not only select our best, and give them proper incentives to serve, but we must give them the advanced, technological training and education without which no war or military operation can be efficiently and successfully conducted today.

Drafted young men forced to serve for 6 months or 2 years and then returned to their homes, while the fast-moving, military-scientific parade leaves them far behind, cannot hope to meet the manpower requirements of this day and age.

I cannot subscribe to, nor do I approve of, the kind of logic and consistency of military policy which cuts the size of the Army, the Reserves, the National Guard, and other components, as has been done, and then seeks to justify the draft of additional young men from civilian life.

Nor can I reconcile the draft with the fact that such a small percentage of trained draftees reenlists in the service at the end of their tour of duty.

It is dismaying, too, to note the failure of the services to build up the numerical strength and training programs of the Reserves.

In addition, the apparent unwillingness of the military to recognize the importance and value, not only to the Nation, but to the States and local communities, of the National Guard is little short of astonishing. Failure to be guided by clear congressional mandate in these matters is most regrettable as well as inconsistent with the Constitution.

The American people want a strong, well-trained National Guard, and Congress must insist upon keeping up the strength of this great military organization. Likewise, Congress must keep up the strength of the Reserves.

I am not one of those who engage in unreasoning criticism of military leaders. To the contrary, I may say that I most highly appraise these men. I know of no group better qualified in their fields, more patriotic, more effectively devoted to their tasks, more sincerely dedicated than our military leaders.

However that may be, and as proud and grateful as we all are for their de-

votion and ability, the military was not intended by the Constitution to dominate this government. It is the duty and function of Congress to provide for the common defense. We cannot escape, nor should we delegate, that responsibility.

The Nation is not at war, and we hope it will not be at war. We are not in a state of limited or unlimited national emergency. We are facing a great challenge to our free system which we must face with strongest determination to maintain an adequate defense and all-powerful striking force. Congress must unhesitatingly and expeditiously enact all legislation to that end.

But we cannot and should not in any circumstances legislate from a posture of hysteria, timidity, or uncertainty. It is not necessary to reshape or disrupt our social, educational and economic systems in order to set up an efficient, adequate national defense with well-trained personnel.

What we do here today will have great influence and bearing on our future strength and orientation. It will determine whether we have that awareness that will prompt us speedily and efficiently to adapt our military programs to the urgencies and inescapable demands of the space age, or whether in moments of complaisance and inertia, or mere stubborn adherence to 19th century concepts, we will continue to string along with programs that would be essentially better fitted to the philosophy and methods of Maginot line techniques than to the urgent, inexorable demands of the space century.

The very great American, the chairman of our esteemed Armed Services Committee, has the outstanding ability, patriotism, broad experience, able leadership, and dedicated zeal to cope with all these crucial problems.

While I respectfully differ with him and other Members on certain aspects of our manpower program, I am confident and hopeful that in this Congress we can, if we will, draw on our imaginativeness, knowledge, and boldness to attack space-age problems with space-age methods and space-age thinking and action.

Since I believe this is the best course for the Nation, I will adhere to it by voice and vote as long as I may be honored and privileged to be a Member of this greatest of all deliberative, democratic, representative bodies.

Mr. Chairman, let us courageously tackle the manpower and other problems of our military and defense system by looking forward and not backward. In war, we would immediately need the draft, so let us keep the selective system in full, standby efficiency to be ready for any eventuality.

But, in peacetime, and generally as a means of selecting and training young Americans for military service, it is a method completely outmoded. We should retain it only long enough to adopt a more realistic system.

Let us speedily adapt our defense and our Nation to the great new age in which we live. Let us make sure that our strength, military, economic and

spiritual, is great and powerful in the realm of national defense and well-being.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], when he discussed the rule on this bill, stated that he was in favor of the legislation, but reluctantly.

I think he summarized in one sentence the feelings that all of us have with regard to the draft law. No one likes to vote for a draft law—just as no one likes to vote for a tax bill.

But when the security of the Nation is threatened as it has been, is now, and apparently evermore shall be, then we have no alternative but to meet our obligation to keep this Nation militarily strong.

The bill before the House today is a manpower bill, a bill dealing with the most precious item that the Nation possesses—manpower. By enacting this bill we indicate to the entire world our determination to remain strong. And I sincerely hope that we will not weaken this bill or attempt to sugar-coat it in any way by reducing the extension period from 4 years to 2 years. We extended the draft period for 4 years in 1955 because world conditions were grave at that time. Certainly no one is so naive as to believe that world conditions have improved since that time.

We have passed laws to make a service career more attractive, but we know that there just are not enough volunteers in the Nation to meet our active duty military manpower requirements which exceed 2½ million men.

As much as we may personally hope for the end of the draft, let us not create false hopes or complacency in the American people by weakening this demonstration of a determined effort on our part to remain strong.

The world watches us today as we consider this extremely important measure. Whatever action we take will be noted not only in American newspapers, but within the walls of the Kremlin. They are looking for weakness—any sign of weakness. Let us not give them such a sign today.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we should abolish the draft at this time. A critical manpower need exists and for the present at least, the draft is essential to the meeting of that real need. However, as with any continuing program, I believe it incumbent upon Congress to periodically reexamine the existing situation. A 2-year extension would insure a continuous supply of manpower for the immediate future and at the same time would allow time for a proper study of the problem to pave the way for a more workable and equitable program better designed to meet the future defense needs of our country.

I remain unconvinced that a blanket 4-year draft extension is essential. We have been told it has been done that way in the past with the implication that it consequently should be done that way in the future. I disagree. No arguments have been advanced on behalf of the 4-year draft that cannot be equally well met by a 2-year draft.

Confident that this shorter extension, coupled with a study commission, will maintain our defense needs, I voted for the amendment for a 2-year extension, but will support final passage because of my conviction that some extension is necessary at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950; pursuant to House Resolution 153, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit, which is at the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MASON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2260 to the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 381, nays 20, answering "present" 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—381

Abbitt	Bailey	Blatnik
Abernethy	Baker	Blitch
Adair	Baldwin	Boggs
Addonizio	Barden	Boland
Albert	Baring	Bolling
Alexander	Barr	Bolton
Alford	Barrett	Bonner
Alger	Barry	Bosch
Allen	Bass, Tenn.	Bow
Anderson,	Bates	Bowles
Mont.	Baumhart	Boykin
Andrews	Becker	Boyle
Anfuso	Beckworth	Brademas
Arends	Belcher	Bray
Ashley	Bennett, Fla.	Breeding
Ashmore	Bennett, Mich.	Brewster
Auchincloss	Bentley	Brock
Avery	Berry	Brooks, La.
Ayres	Betts	Brooks, Tex.

Broomfield
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Burdick
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison
Byrne, Pa.
Eynes, Wis.
Cahill
Canfield
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chipherfield
Church
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dollinger
Dooley
Dorn, N.Y.
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durham
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Fasell
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynn
Flynt
Foley
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Gialmo
Glenn
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Healey
Hibert
Hechler

Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hogan
Holifield
Holland
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Irwin
Jackson
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kasem
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Klitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Kowalski
Lafore
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Levering
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Loser
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McFall
McGinley
McGovern
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Matthews
May
Morrow
Metcalf
Michel
Miller
Clement W.
Miller
George P.
Mills
Minshall
Mitchell
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morris, Okla.
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Mumma
Murphy
Natcher

Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Oliver
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Polk
Preston
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Quile
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rhodes, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
St. George
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wainwright
Wallhauser
Walter
Wampler

Watts
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Wharton

Whitten
Widnall
Willis
Wilson
Wolf

Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—20

Carter
Dorn, S.C.
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Harmon
Hoffman, Mich.
Kastenmeier

Lane
Marshall
Mason
Meyer
Moulder
Philbin
Porter

Shipley
Siler
Smith, Kans.
Wier
Williams
Winstead

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Johnson, Colo.

NOT VOTING—32

Andersen,
Minn.
Aspinall
Bass, N.H.
Buckley
Bush
Carnahan
Chelf
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson

Donohue
Evins
Farbstein
Fogarty
Green, Pa.
Hagen
Hargis
Martin
Meador
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken

Morgan
Murray
Passman
Powell
Reed
Spence
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Whitener
Withrow
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Johnson of Colorado against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Passman with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Meador.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Reed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) continuing the Joint Committee on Washington Problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems created by H. Con. Res. 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby continued through September 30, 1959.

SEC. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1959, through September 30, 1959, which shall not exceed \$30,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE
AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1959: Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, California; Hon. ALTON LENNON, North Carolina; and Hon. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, California.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the legislative program for next week. I think I might follow that request for information by suggesting that, of course, next week is Lincoln's birthday which is a matter of tremendous interest to many people on my side of the aisle. In addition, we are going to have a joint session here on Thursday which, I hope, will be attended by as many Members as can be here. With that statement, I would like the gentleman from Massachusetts to tell us what we may expect in the way of a legislative program next week.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 6, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and
4 Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467 (c)), is
5 amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and
6 inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter
8 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208) , is amended by striking out

1 the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1,
2 1963" in place thereof.

3 SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act
4 of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended
5 by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the
6 words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public
8 Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out
9 the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1,
10 1963" in place thereof.

Passed the House of Representatives February 5, 1959.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

FEBRUARY 6, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

Issued March 10, 1959
For actions of March 9, 1959
86th-1st, No. 37

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....	2,48		
Agriculture Committee....	18		
Area redevelopment.....	20,41,49		
Budget.....	7		
Buildings.....	45		
CCC.....	7		
Centennial celebration....	22		
Commission.....	63		
Contracts.....	8,36,56		
Cooperatives.....	28		
Disaster loans.....	55		
Durum wheat.....	48		
Economic conditions.....	21		
Education.....	6,34		
Electrification.....	39		
Employment.....	9,51		
Ethics.....	52		
Expenditures.....	7		
Farm program.....	17,29		
Feed grains.....	42		
FHA.....	7		
Fish transportation.....	24		
Flood control.....	41		
Food assistance.....	49		
Foreign affairs.....	25		
Foreign aid.....	33		
Foreign trade.....	46		
Forest products.....	59		
Forestry.....	12,26		
4-H Clubs.....	30		
Grains.....	10,42		
Health.....	60		
Industrial uses.....	59		
Inflation.....	32		
Information.....	63		
Lands.....	47		
Legislative program.....	17		
Military training.....	3,17		
Milk.....	19,44		
Monopolies.....	53		
Nominations.....	4		
Peanuts.....	35		
Personnel.....	9,43,52		
Prices.....	54		
Price supports.....	5,10,42		
Public debt.....	38,58,62		
REA.....	7		
Research.....	13,14,59		
Saline water.....	14		
Small business.....	55		
Soil conservation.....	13		
Special milk.....	44		
Statehood.....	17,31		
Surplus foods.....	20,37,41,57		
Textiles.....	15		
Transportation.....	50		
Water compact.....	61		
Water conservation.....	13		
Water pollution.....	16,23,40		
Water resources.....	11		
Wheat.....	1,48		
Wilderness.....	27		

HIGHLIGHTS: Rep. Johnson, Wisc., and others criticized local milk sanitary standards as being trade barriers. Rep. Curtis criticized the Joint Economic Committee report. Reps. Dixon, Avery, Jensen, and King commended USDA and land-grant colleges and their centennial celebration plans. Both Houses received from this Department proposed bills to: Eliminate 30-acre limitation on wheat produced for use on farm. Extend automatic preservation of acreage allotment histories. Sen. Yarborough et al and several Reps. introduced and Sen. Yarborough, Reps. McGovern, and Breeding discussed bills to increase feed-grain support levels. Rep. Langen and others introduced and Rep. Langen discussed bills to increase and extend special milk program.

SENATE

1. WHEAT. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to eliminate the 30-acre limitation on the amount of wheat exempt from wheat marketing quotas where all the wheat produced on the farm is used on the farm for feed, food, and seed; to Agriculture Committee and Agriculture and Forestry Committee. pp. 3133, 3291
2. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to provide for the extension of the automatic preservation of acreage allotment histories; to Agriculture Committee and Agriculture and Forestry Committee. pp. 3133, 3291
3. MILITARY TRAINING. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendments H. R. 2260, to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (S. Rept. 96). p. 3141
4. NOMINATIONS. Confirmed the nomination of James W. Riddleberger to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, Department of State. p. 3160
5. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Young expressed his concern over recent criticism of farm program costs, and inserted a statement prepared by the National Grange, "Who Gets Government Subsidies?", defending price support payments to farmers against recent criticism. pp. 3161-3
6. EDUCATION. Sen. Keating commended the accomplishments of the American Farm School in Greece during its 55-year history. pp. 3170-1
7. BUDGET; EXPENDITURES. Sen. Byrd inserted his statement criticizing "the growing contrivance to evade both appropriation review and control by writing final authority to spend from Federal debt receipts directly into substantive law," and cited CCC as an example involving the cancellation of \$3.3 billion of CCC notes, and referred to REA and FHA as examples of agencies whose expenditures are controlled through the regular appropriation process. p. 3175
8. CONTRACTS. Received from the Labor Department a proposed bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the U. S.; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 3133
9. PERSONNEL. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau a proposed bill "to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committees. pp. 3133, 3291
Sen. Byrd submitted, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch for Nov. 1958 to Jan. 1959. pp. 3141-4
10. PRICE SUPPORTS; GRAINS. Both Houses received a N. Mex. resolution urging the "Secretary of Agriculture to correct administratively the discrimination against the high plains area of the United States with respect to the nominal price support applied to agricultural production of grain sorghums in relation to preference given the midwestern area in the relatively high price supports applied to agricultural production of corn." pp. 3133, 3294
11. WATER RESOURCES. Received a Mont. Legislature resolution urging the rejection of a Bureau of Reclamation proposal to divert water from the Madison River. p. 3135

EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT AND RELATED AUTHORITIES

MARCH 9, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 2260]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2260), to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENTS

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1959" wherever such date appears therein and inserting "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

Amend the title so as to read:

To extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendment provides authority to continue beyond July 1, 1959, payments of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty subsequent to that date. Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, now are eligible for the special pay provided in section 203(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Unless the present terminal date of July 1, 1959, is extended, those medical, dental, and veterinary officers entering on active duty subsequent to that date

would not be entitled to receive special pay while those who entered on active duty prior to July 1, 1959, would continue to receive the pay.

The title has been amended because of the committee amendment.

PURPOSE

This bill would extend for a period of 4 years, from July 1, 1959, through July 1, 1963, the following provisions of law:

- (1) The authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces.
- (2) The authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists and allied specialists.
- (3) The suspension of permanent limitations on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces.
- (4) The authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents irrespective of rank if the dependents are not furnished Government quarters.
- (5) The authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty.

THE DRAFT

Legislative history

Public Law 51 of the 82d Congress, which amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 and changed its name to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, was enacted on June 19, 1951. Approved during the Korean war, the purpose of this act was to raise immediately the manpower necessary to build and maintain an armed force of the size determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be our minimum security requirement and to provide for the maintenance of an adequate force of trained Reserves for the future security of the United States. Under section 17(c) of the act, no person is to be inducted after July 1, 1959, except deferred persons whose liability continues after this date.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 was approved after the President reported that the Armed Forces had been unable by voluntary recruitment to maintain the active-duty strength required by a deterioration in the international situation. Despite extensive recruiting efforts; the Armed Forces at that time numbered 1,384,000—considerably below the desired strength of slightly more than 2 million, but still the largest voluntary force in the history of the Nation. In the first 6 months after enactment of the 1948 act the Armed Forces recruited 200,000 more men than were recruited in a similar period before the act was approved. Because of this stimulating effect on enlistments only 30,129 men had to be inducted between enactment and June 30, 1950.

Major features of the present system

Training and service.—In brief, the Universal Military Training and Service Act provides that all male persons in the United States must register with their local boards at age 18; that those between the ages of 18½ and 26 are liable for training and service in the Armed Forces; that they may not be rejected for physical or mental reasons if they meet minimum standards (the President may modify these standards except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress); that each person inducted shall be given full and ade-

quate military training for no less than 4 months; and that no inductee shall be assigned to duty outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions until he has the equivalent of at least 4 months of basic training. The period of service for persons inducted is 24 months except that the Secretary of Defense has authority to provide for their earlier discharge or transfer to the Reserve. A registrant may enlist in the Regular Army for 2 years instead of being inducted and within quotas established for their local boards registrants between the ages of 18 and 26 may volunteer for induction. (A person over the age of 17 may volunteer for induction with the written consent of his parent or guardian.) Section 651(a) of title 10, United States Code, the provisions of which were formerly contained in the Universal Military Training and Service Act, requires that persons entering the Armed Forces after August 9, 1955, must serve on active duty and in a Reserve component for 6 years.

Deferments and exemptions.—Deferments may be authorized by the President for persons in any category of industry, agriculture, or other employment, or whose activity in study, research, medical, dental, scientific, and some additional endeavors is found to be “necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.” The President cannot, however, defer all persons in any particular category; deferments must be made on the basis of individual status. A deferred person remains liable for induction until he is 35 years old.

Deferments are also authorized for persons with children or with dependents (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship), for college students to permit them to complete an academic year when they have been ordered to report for induction during that year, and for high school students until their graduation, reaching age 20, or until they stop satisfactory study, whichever first occurs. Certain Federal and State officials may be deferred, as well as persons who join National Guard units before reaching the age of 18½ if they continue to participate satisfactorily. Persons enrolled in the senior division of the ROTC program are also eligible for deferment.

Exemptions (as contrasted to deferments) are authorized for members of the Armed Forces on active duty, cadets and midshipmen at service Academies, students in officer procurement programs in military colleges approved by the Secretary of Defense, ministers and students of the ministry, sole surviving sons, veterans (as defined in the law), and persons who were in Organized Reserve units on February 1, 1951, and who have continued to serve satisfactorily.

Selection.—As soon as practical after registration each registrant must be classified to determine his availability for induction. The classification process is the key to the induction process. Classification must be accomplished in the spirit of the act which is that “In a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.”

After registering at 18, the registrant is not liable for induction until reaching the age 18½. The registrant may be eligible for deferment or exemption when classified and thus not be immediately available when he reaches the age of 18½.

The President is authorized to select and induct persons by age group or groups and to select and induct physicians and dentists. Under such authority persons who are classified as available for service are selected and inducted in the following sequence:

(1) Delinquents who have attained age 19 in the order of their dates of birth, with the oldest first;

(2) Volunteers under the age of 26, in the sequence of their volunteering for induction;

(3) Registrants between the ages of 19 and 26 who are not fathers, in the order of their dates of birth, with the oldest first;

(4) Registrants between the ages of 19 and 26 who are fathers in the order of their dates of birth, with the oldest first;

(5) Nonvolunteers aged 26 and older in the order of their dates of birth, with the youngest first;

(6) Registrants between the ages of 18½ and 19 in the order of their dates of birth, with the oldest first.

Under present conditions no local board has found it necessary to reach below the third category to fill calls. The result is that fathers are not deferred (with an attendant extension of liability for induction) but are not reached for induction.

The calls of the Armed Forces are met by quotas established for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia on the basis of the number of men available for service in that particular State, Territory, possession, or District, with provision for credits for registrants who are already members of the Armed Forces. Within States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia the quotas are subdivided among the political subdivisions in accordance with the number of men available for service in each such subdivision. In practice, quotas are determined by applying a rejection rate, based on experience, against the number of men available for service in the age groups currently being inducted. Registrants serving on active duty affect the quotas of the political subdivision from which they entered service by reducing the number of available men and, hence, the quota for such subdivision.

Results of present system

To evaluate the effects of the present system the Department of Defense conducted a statistical study of the military service status of men of draft age in this country. This study dealt not only with the current situation, but also was projected through fiscal year 1963. Findings from this study should serve to allay some popular misconceptions about the draft. These findings were reviewed and found accurate by other Federal agencies having manpower responsibilities, such as the Selective Service System, the Department of Labor, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

A question frequently asked is whether many young men are reaching age 26 without having performed military service. To answer this question the Defense study examined the status of men at age 26. The study showed that on June 30, 1958, there were about 1,100,000 in this age class. Of this total 770,000 had entered military service; 240,000 were not qualified for physical or mental reasons; and about 90,000 were deferred for various reasons or were eligible for deferment because they were fathers. By actual count, the number of nonfathers between ages 25½ and 26 who were classified I-A on June 30, 1958,

was 647. This demonstrates that only a negligible number of qualified nonfathers had avoided military service.

The study did not stop at this point. It made extrapolations extending to June 30, 1963, the end of the period that the extension of the authority to induct would cover. This projection estimated that on June 30, 1963, there will be about 1,150,000 men at the age of 26. The estimate is that of this total 630,000 will have entered the service; 340,000 will have been found not qualified for physical or mental reasons (higher than the 1959 figure because mental standards recently have been raised); and 180,000 will have been deferred for various reasons or will have been eligible for deferment because of being fathers. On June 30, 1963, it is estimated that the number of qualified nonfathers between the ages of 25½ and 26 in class I-A will be less than 5,000. If this projection is accurate, and there is no reason to suspect that it is not, the conclusion is that virtually no I-A nonfather who is qualified physically and mentally and not eligible for deferment can avoid military service.

In summary, of all registrants reaching the age of 26 in 1958, 90 percent of the *qualified* registrants were serving on active duty or had completed their military obligation. Seventy percent of all registrants, including those *not qualified*, had completed, or were in the process of completing, their military obligation. For registrants reaching the age of 26 in 1963, it is estimated that 55 percent of them will have fulfilled, or will be fulfilling, their military obligation and that almost 80 percent of the *qualified* registrants will have fulfilled, or will be fulfilling, their military obligation.

Such a result seems paradoxical when one considers that more than 1,200,000 young men will reach the age of 18½ each year from now until 1963 and that only about 100,000 persons will be inducted in 1959. A part of the explanation is that in an average year more than 500,000 persons enter the Armed Forces as inductees, enlistees, or in the 6-month training program. Another factor is that fathers are not being inducted; some of them are deferred for dependency reasons and others are in class I-A but in such a low priority for induction that they are not reached under present circumstances. Still another factor is the high rate of rejection for failure to meet mental and physical qualifications. The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent.

The committee has concluded that continuation of authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces is necessary to maintain the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces at levels required for the national defense. Although the number of persons being inducted is relatively small, and despite the fact that the Army is the only one of the Armed Forces requiring inductees, the authority to induct under the Universal Military Training and Service Act serves as a stimulus to voluntary enlistments in the other Armed Forces.

The committee recommends extension of this authority as further evidence to the world of the determination of this country to defend itself. Although the committee will continue to examine possibilities of improving defense manpower utilization and of eliminating whatever inequities inhere in the existing system of manpower procurement, international conditions today are such that it would be foolhardy not to continue the authority to induct.

SELECTIVE INDUCTION FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Section 6(h) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act provides that persons deferred from service remain liable for induction until age 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur the liability for induction until age 35 under this section. Until 1957 there was no authority to select persons for induction on the basis of their professional abilities or skills.

To permit such selective induction without also inducting unneeded persons, Public Law 85-62, approved June 27, 1957, authorized the President to levy special calls for medical, dental, and allied specialists. This law also provided authority for ordering physicians and dentists who were members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they have not reached age 35 and have not already served on active duty for at least 1 year.

The combination of authority for selective induction of physicians and dentists and the authority for ordering physicians and dentists who were members of Reserve components to active duty permitted this special authority to operate by indirection. No inductions have been made under this authority since the physicians and dentists who were liable have accepted Reserve commissions and have been ordered to active duty as needed.

Replacement requirements of the Department of Defense for physicians in fiscal year 1960 are 1,950; for fiscal year 1961, 1,400; for fiscal year 1962, 1,900; and for fiscal year 1963, 1,375.

Replacement requirements for dentists in fiscal year 1960 are 1,100; in fiscal year 1961, 950; in fiscal year 1962, 1,150; and in fiscal year 1963, 950.

The required replacements are fewer than those of previous years. This reduction in requirements is attributable largely to the effectiveness of the Medical and Dental Officer Career Incentive Act of 1956. This act authorized increased special pay for physicians and dentists. As a result of this act the strengths of the Regular Medical and Dental Corps have increased in the three military departments. Despite this fact about 50 percent of all physicians and about 60 percent of all dentists on active duty on June 30, 1959, will be noncareer officers. Expiration of the special authority for induction of physicians and dentists would undoubtedly reduce the number of physicians and dentists who accept Reserve commissions and are called to active duty in this status. Such an effect would cause the military departments to have an inadequate number of physicians and dentists.

The ratio of physicians on active duty to total personnel is 3.4 physicians per 1,000 troop strength. The ratio of dentists on active duty to total personnel is 2 dentists per 1,000 troop strength.

DEPENDENTS' ASSISTANCE ACT

The peacetime policy of the Armed Forces would not permit the enlistment or reenlistment of members of the lower three pay grades and part of the fourth pay grade with dependents. For this reason the Career Compensation Act of 1949 did not authorize a quarters allowance for pay grades E-1, E-2, E-3, and E-4 with less than 7 years of service. In time of peace the absence of authority for

paying quarters allowances to these grades presented no problem. The partial mobilization following hostilities in Korea, however, required the utilization on active duty of persons with dependents in the lower pay grades. Consequently the Congress enacted the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 which prescribed a system of quarters allowances for all enlisted grades. These quarters allowances are graduated according to grade. The following table illustrates the allowances now payable.

Pay grade	Not over 2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-9-----	\$77.10	\$96.90
E-8-----	77.10	96.90
E-7-----	77.10	96.90
E-6-----	77.10	96.90
E-5-----	77.10	96.90
E-4-----	77.10	96.90

Pay grade	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-3-----	\$51.30	\$77.10	\$96.90
E-2-----	51.30	77.10	96.90
E-1-----	51.30	77.10	96.90

To receive these allowances a member must have in effect an allotment payable to his dependents in an amount equal to the allowance plus \$40 for members of pay grades E-1, E-2, and E-3; \$60 for pay grades E-4 and E-5; and \$80 for pay grades E-6 and above.

If the Dependents' Assistance Act is not extended the quarters allowances payable to enlisted members would revert to the permanent authorizations contained in section 302(f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Under these permanent authorizations persons in pay grades E-4 with less than 7 years of service and all persons in pay grades E-1 through E-3 are ineligible for quarters allowances for their dependents. Persons in other pay grades would be entitled to a maximum of \$67.50 as a quarters allowance. At a time when it is necessary to use persons in the lower pay grades with dependents on active duty it obviously is necessary to continue the provision for their dependents.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Section 2 of the bill would amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect a suspension of ceilings on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

Various provisions of law impose restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces. These personnel strengths which were intended to apply in normal times total only slightly more than 2 million persons. Since the buildup of our Armed Forces following hostilities in Korea it has been necessary to suspend these ceilings. The act of August 3, 1950, suspended the ceilings until July 1, 1954. Public Law 307 of the 83d Congress extended the suspension until July 31, 1957. Public Law 85-63 extended the suspension until July 1, 1959, at which time the peacetime ceiling would become effective unless the suspension is extended as contemplated by this bill.

The necessity for continuation of the suspension still exists. At the end of fiscal year 1959 the active duty strength of the Armed Forces is estimated to be 2,525,000 persons. It is obvious that the size of the Armed Forces cannot safely be reduced to only slightly more than 2 million persons as would be necessary if this part of the bill is not enacted.

The effect of reducing active-duty strength to the peacetime ceiling would be particularly severe on the Air Force. Without an extension of the suspension ceilings provided in this bill, the Air Force would have to reduce its force to 502,000, a reduction of almost 350,000 from its estimated strength on June 30, 1959, of 850,000. The effects on the Army and the Navy would be not quite so drastic but failure to continue suspension of the ceilings would cause both the Army and the Navy to reduce their strength below levels planned for the next fiscal year.

For the period of time that the permanent strength limitations are suspended there comes into effect a secondary ceiling of 5 million persons on the active duty personnel strengths of the Armed Forces. This secondary limitation will remain in effect during the period of suspension of the permanent limitations involved in this bill.

Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, which codified titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code repealed the source laws on which the sections printed above were based since the sections represented a restatement and reenactment of the ceilings. Section 50 of Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, provides that if on the effective date of that act a provision of law that is restated in that act and repealed by section 53 thereof would have been in a suspended or temporarily superseded status except for its repeal, the provisions of Public Law 1028 that restate the provision have the same suspended or temporarily superseded status. For this technical reason section 2 of the bill amends the act of August 3, 1950, instead of Public Law 1028, 84th Congress.

The primary laws prescribing personnel ceilings have been codified in various sections of title 10, United States Code. Printed below is a summary of these limitations.

ARMY

Section 3201. Army: Members on active duty—

(a) The authorized strength of the Army in members on active duty, exclusive of—(1) officer candidates; (2) Reserves on active duty for training; (3) members paid from appropriations for the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve; and (4) Reserves ordered to active duty in an emergency (after July 10, 1950)—is 837,000.

These provisions are derived from section 102(a) of the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949, Public Law 604, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 322); and section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, Public Law 759, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 605), and as restated in section 2 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, Public Law 51, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 76). The reference to 1-year enlistees as an excepted category in section 102 (Army and Air Force Authorization Act), was omitted in the codification to conform to section 2 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act because the 1-year enlistee program was abolished by section 1(h) of the 1951 amendments to that act (65 Stat. 80).

Section 3203 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Army: Members on active duty—

The authorized strength of the Regular Army in members on active duty, exclusive of officer candidates, is 837,000 less the number of members of the Army on active duty who are neither members of the Regular Army nor members of the Army in the categories listed in section 3201(a)(1)–(4).

This section was inserted in the codification to make explicit in the law the authorized strength of the Regular Army, which was previously inferred from provisions relating to the strength of the Army and members on active duty.

AIR FORCE

Section 8201 (title 10, U.S.C.) Air Force: Members on active duty—

(a) The authorized strength of the Air Force in members on active duty, exclusive of—(1) officer candidates; (2) aviation cadets; (3) Reserves on active duty for training; (4) members paid from appropriations for the Air National Guard or the Air Force Reserve; and (5) Reserves ordered to active duty in an emergency—is 502,000.

The codification of the personnel ceilings for the Air Force is derived from section 202(a) of the Army and Air Force Authorization Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 323); and section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 and as restated in section 2 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (65 Stat. 76).

Section 8203 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Air Force: Members on active duty—

Provides the same clarification for the Regular Air Force as section 3203 does for the Army and for the same reasons.

NAVY

Section 5401 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Navy: Enlisted members—

(a) The authorized strength of the Regular Navy in enlisted members, excluding retired members and members furloughed without pay, is 500,000. * * *

This section was derived mainly from section 2(a) of the act of April 18, 1946 (to increase authorized enlisted strength) (60 Stat. 92).

Section 5402 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Marine Corps: Total enlisted members—

Provides that the authorized strength of the Regular Marine Corps, excluding retired members, is 400,000 except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress.

In the codification of title 10, this section was derived from the act of June 28, 1952, Public Law 416, 82d Congress (66 Stat. 282).

Section 5403 (title 10 U.S.C.) Navy: Line Officers on the active list—

Provides that the active list of the Navy in line officers shall be equal to 7 percent of the authorized strength of the Regular Navy in enlisted members (see sec. 5401 above). In the codification of title 10, this section was mainly derived from section 4 of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92).

Section 5404 (title 10, U.S.C.) Navy: Staff corps officers on the active list—

This section provides various authorities for the strength of Navy supply, civil engineers, Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Chaplain Corps, Medical Service Corps, and Nurse Corps strengths which are based on percentages of the Regular Navy enlisted strength of section 5401 above. In the codification of title 10, this section was derived from 38 Stat. 40, 39 Stat. 576 and 581, 49 Stat. 488, 54 Stat. 527, 61 Stat. 96, 61 Stat. 877, 61 Stat. 736, and 62 Stat. 366.

ARMED FORCES, WOMEN

Section 3209 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Army: Commissioned officers on active list; other branches; Women's Army Corps—

Provides that the authorized strength of the Women's Army Corps in commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army is prescribed by the Secretary, however, it may not be more than 2 percent of the authorized strength of the Regular Army in commissioned officers on the active list.

Section 3215 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Army: Women's Army Corps; warrant officers on active list; enlisted members on active duty—

Provides that the strengths of the Women's Army Corps of the Regular Army in warrant officers and enlisted members on active duty is as prescribed by the Secretary, however, it may not be more than 2 percent of the authorized strength prescribed in section 3214 (which is 837,000 less the officer components and stated exclusions in sec. 3201(a) above).

In the codification of title 10, sections 3209 and 3215 were mainly derived from section 102 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357).

Section 8208 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Air Force: * * * Female commissioned officers other than those designated to perform professional functions.

Section 8215 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Air Force: Female warrant officers on the active list; female enlisted members on active duty.

These sections provide strength limitations on the number of female officers, warrant officers, and enlisted members on active duty by providing that the Secretary may prescribe such numbers; however, they may not exceed 2 percent of the authorized strength of the Regular Air Force.

In the codification of title 10, these sections were mainly derived from section 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 371).

Section 5410 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps: Enlisted women.

Section 5411 (title 10, U.S.C.) Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps: Women officers.

These sections provide limitations on women officers and enlisted women of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps and provide that the authorized strength shall be 2 percent of the Regular Navy in enlisted members (see sec. 5401 above) and 2 percent of the authorized strength of the Regular Marine Corps in enlisted members (see sec. 5402 above), and also provide for the strength of women officers.

In the codification of title 10, these sections were mainly derived from section 202 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 363).

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

Under existing law physicians, dentists, and veterinarians on active duty or entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, receive special pay as authorized in section 203(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Unless the authority for this special pay is continued beyond July 1, 1959, those physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after that date would not be entitled to receive special pay but those who have entered on active duty prior to July 1, 1959, would continue to receive the pay.

Section 203(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 authorizes the following amounts of special pay: Medical and dental officers receive a scale of special pay graduated in accordance with their length of service as medical and dental officers. Those with less than 2 years of such duty receive \$100 per month; those with service of from 3 to 6 years receive \$150 per month; those with service of between 6 and 10 years receive \$200 per month; and those with more than 10 years of service receive \$250 per month. Veterinary officers receive special pay of \$100 per month regardless of their length of service.

These special payments are intended to make military medical compensation more competitive with incomes received by persons in civilian life with similar experience.

It seems clear that these special payments and other special provisions for doctors, dentists, and veterinarians have improved the career structure of these corps.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

Printed below and hereby made a part of this report are a letter from the Secretary of Defense dated January 9, 1959, and a letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense dated February 10, 1959, requesting enactment of the authorities contained in this bill, indicating that it will cause no increase in the budget of the Department of Defense, and stating that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to it.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 9, 1959.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it is in accord with the program of the President. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The principal purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service

Act, including special calls for the induction of persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, until July 1, 1963. Without such authority it would not be possible to maintain the military strength levels, Active and Reserve, deemed necessary to insure our national security.

In order to meet total military manpower requirements, it has been necessary to make consistent use of the draft authority during the past several years. In addition, the existence of the authority has stimulated many men to volunteer for military service. Many persons enlist in the service of their choice, enter ROTC or other officer programs, or enter Reserve programs in preference to being inducted. The loss of the draft authority would have adverse effects on all of these important programs.

Continuing authority is also needed to make special calls for physicians, dentists, and other medical specialists. Draft-inspired volunteers have been the principal source of medical and dental officers during the past several years. The act operates in such a manner that the required number of physicians and dentists affected by its provisions accept commissions and are subsequently ordered to active duty as commissioned officers.

Many steps have been taken to enhance the ability of the military departments to attract and retain qualified manpower by voluntary means. The Congress has been extremely helpful in this respect by providing legislation such as the military pay bill, the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act, and the Dependents' Medical Care Act. It is apparent, however, that volunteer programs alone will not meet all of the military manpower needs. We therefore regard the proposed legislation as absolutely imperative to the security of the Nation at this time and for the foreseeable future.

This proposal would also extend until July 1, 1963, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 655, 81st Cong. (64 Stat. 408)), as amended. In 1957, suspension of the limitation on the authorized active duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, as well as other limitations on the authorized personnel strength of other components and branches of the Armed Forces, was extended until July 1, 1959 (Public Law 85-63 (71 Stat. 208)).

Active duty personnel requirements of the Armed Forces have exceeded basic legislative limitations since 1951. Congress has, in the past, recognized that it would be impossible for the Armed Forces to meet their commitments under the authorized strengths contained in existing law. Unless the suspension of the permanent personnel strength ceilings is continued, a substantial reduction from approximately 2,500,000 to approximately 2 million would be required. This would result in the demobilization of large segments of active combat and supporting elements, and clearly would be detrimental to national security in view of the continued uncertainty of world conditions.

Further, the proposal would also extend the Dependents' Assistance Act, which otherwise would terminate on July 1, 1959. The 4-year extension coincides with the proposed extension of the induction authority. This is necessary to enable enlisted members with dependents to continue in receipt of increased allowances for quarters, thereby assuring adequate financial assistance for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, inducted or enlisted in the future as well as those now on active duty. Termination of this legislation would

impose undue financial hardship upon members who are ordered into the Armed Forces involuntarily. Additionally, to allow this legislation to expire would act as a deterrent to those who might otherwise volunteer for military service.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements within the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL McELROY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 10, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for authority to make payments of special pay for certain physicians, dentists, and veterinarians after June 30, 1959.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide authority to continue beyond July 1, 1959, payments of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty subsequent to that date. At the present time physicians, dentists, and veterinarians on active duty or entering on active duty receive the special pay as provided in section 203(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Unless this proposed legislation is approved by the Congress, those officers entering on active duty subsequent to July 1, 1959, will not be entitled to receive special pay, whereas those who have entered prior thereto will continue to receive the pay.

The present rates of special pay for physicians and dentists were authorized by the Medical and Dental Officer Career Incentive Act of 1956; however, that act did not alter the existing expiration date. Originally, special pay was designed to provide an incentive to physicians and dentists to volunteer for service with the Armed Forces, which were at the time confronted with a serious problem in obtaining sufficient numbers of qualified physicians and dentists. In 1956 the problem of procuring and retaining career medical officers in the armed services became so acute that the Medical and Dental Career Incentive Act of 1956 was enacted. Recognizing that a wide disparity in income existed between the military physician and his civilian counterpart, the Act increased special pay substantially. The 1958 amendments to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which revised

the basic pay structure of the military services, resulted in some additional increase for medical and dental officers; however, the income differential between the military and civilian physician is still quite sizable.

Experience in the past 2 years has shown that the special pay authorized in 1956 has had the desired effect and produced the beneficial results that were anticipated. For the first time in many years there has been a marked increase in Regular medical officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces. More significant is the fact that the resignation rate of medical and dental officers has been considerably reduced. This favorable trend would undoubtedly be reversed and the gains in Regular medical officers in the Armed Forces would soon be wiped out without the authority sought in this legislation.

The Department of Defense is of the opinion that the future recruitment of career medical officers would be seriously impaired if the current rates of special pay are not extended beyond July 1, 1959, or if the current rates are reduced. Without special pay, the military services cannot hope to continue to interest these professional men in a military medical career.

Further, based upon income statistics available, it is estimated that the average annual income of a civilian physician now exceeds \$17,000. Civil service pay scales were recently revised upward and the Veterans' Administration increased salaries for these categories of professional men. It seems apparent that unless the authority to continue special pay is continued, the Armed Forces will be in a highly unfavorable competitive position for physicians both within and without the Government.

It is urgently recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

No additional cost will result from the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES, *Deputy.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

SEC. 17. * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after **[July 1, 1959,]** *July 1, 1963*, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist.

SECTION 1 OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 3, 1950, AS AMENDED

That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213 and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2, title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 101 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until **July 1, 1959** *July 1, 1963*.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

SEC. 16. This Act, except sections 10, 11, and 12 hereof, shall terminate on **July 1, 1959** *July 1, 1963*.

ACT OF JUNE 27, 1957, PUBLIC LAW 85-62

SEC. 9. This Act takes effect July 1, 1957, and shall terminate on **July 1, 1959** *July 1, 1963*.

CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

SEC. 203. (a) The term "commissioned officers", as used in this section, shall be interpreted to mean only (1) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; (2) those commissioned officers in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force and commissioned medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, who were retired prior to September 1, 1947, and who thereafter but prior to **July 1, 1959** *July 1, 1963*, have been or may be assigned to active duty; (3) those officers who, heretofore but subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who, prior to **July 1, 1959** *July 1, 1963* may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force or as medical and dental officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; (4) such officers who on September 1, 1947, were or who thereafter have been or may be commissioned in the Medical and Dental Corps of, or designated as medical or dental officers in, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or as medical and dental officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service and who heretofore, but subsequent to September 1, 1947,

have been called or ordered to extended active duty of one year or longer, or who may, prior to **[July 1, 1959]** *July 1, 1963*, be called or ordered to extended active duty of one year or longer; (5) general officers appointed from the Medical and Dental Corps of, or previously designated as medical or dental officers, in the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who were on active duty on September 1, 1947; and (6) general officers who, subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of, or from those officers designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in parts (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection.

(b) In addition to any pay, allowances, special or incentive pays that they are otherwise entitled to receive, commissioned officers as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section shall be entitled to receive special pay at the rate of—

(1) \$100 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have not completed two years of active service in a category covered by that subsection;

(2) \$100 per month for each month of active service for those veterinary officers covered by subsection (c);

(3) \$150 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have completed at least two years of active service in a category covered by subsection (a);

(4) \$200 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have completed at least six years of active service in a category covered by subsection (a); and

(5) \$250 per month for each month of active service for those medical and dental officers covered by subsection (a) who have completed at least ten years of active service in a category covered by subsection (a):

Provided, That such sums shall not be included in computing the amount of increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this Act or in computing retired pay, disability retirement pay, or any severance pay: *Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a)(4) of this section who are called or ordered to active duty without their consent shall not be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection for any period prior to September 9, 1950: *And provided further*, That no commissioned officer as described in subsection (a) of this section shall, while he is serving as a medical or dental intern, be entitled to receive the special pay provided in this subsection.

(c) Effective July 1, 1953, the term "commissioned officer", as used in this section, shall, in addition to those categories defined in

subsection (a) hereof, include (1) those commissioned officers in the Veterinary Corps of, or designated as veterinary officers in, the Regular Army and Air Force and commissioned veterinary officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who are on active duty on the date of enactment of this subsection; (2) those commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps of, or designated as veterinary officers in, the Regular Army and Air Force and commissioned veterinary officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, who were retired prior to the date of enactment of this subsection and who thereafter but prior to **[July 1, 1959,]** *July 1, 1963*, have been or may be assigned to active duty; (3) those officers who subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection but prior to **[July 1, 1959,]** *July 1, 1963*, may be commissioned in the Veterinary Corps of, or designated as veterinary officers in, the Regular Army and Air Force or as veterinary officers of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; (4) such officers who on the date of enactment of this subsection are or who hereafter may be commissioned in the Veterinary Corps of, or designated as veterinary officers in, the Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or as veterinary officers of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service and who are on active duty on the date of enactment of this subsection as a result of having been called or ordered to extended active duty of one year or longer, or who may, prior to **[July 1, 1959,]** *July 1, 1963*, be called or ordered to extended active duty of one year or longer; (5) general officers appointed from the Veterinary Corps of, or previously designated as veterinary officers in, the Regular Army, the Army Reserve, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve and the Air Force of the United States who are on active duty on the date of enactment of this subsection; and (6) general officers who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, may be appointed from those officers of the Veterinary Corps of, or from those officers designated as veterinary officers in, the Regular Army, the Army Reserve, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in parts (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection.



Calendar No. 89

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

[Report No. 96]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 6, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 9, 1959

Reported by Mr. RUSSELL, with amendments

[Insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and
4 Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467 (c)), is
5 amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and
6 inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter
8 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208) , is amended by striking out

1 the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1,
2 1963" in place thereof.

3 SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act
4 of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended
5 by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the
6 words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof.

7 SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public
8 Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out
9 the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1,
10 1963" in place thereof.

11 *SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of*
12 *1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1959"*
13 *wherever such date appears therein and inserting "July 1,*
14 *1963" in lieu thereof.*

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend the
induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and
Service Act, and for other purposes."

Passed the House of Representatives February 5, 1959.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

[Report No. 96]

AN ACT

To extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

FEBRUARY 6, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

MARCH 9, 1959

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued March 11, 1959
For actions of March 10, 1959
86th-1st, No. 38

Area redevelopment..	16,24
Budget.....	2,13,26
Budgeting.....	20
Cheese.....	11
Contracts.....	38
Country life.....	39
Disease.....	15
Education.....	25
Electrification.....	10,31
Expenditures.....	26
Farm program.....	18
Flood prevention.....	1
Food costs.....	23
Housing.....	13
Inflation.....	12
Information.....	34
Item veto.....	20
Lands.....	27,30
Legislative program.....	7
Military training.....	9
Milk.....	35

Natural resources.....	19
Nominations.....	17
Personnel.....	29
Price supports.....	11
Prices.....	37
Public debt.....	2,22
Public works.....	16
Reclamation.....	28
Research.....	4,15
Roads.....	14
Special milk.....	35
Statehood.....	6,21
Surplus food.....	16
Surplus property.....	32
Transportation.....	33
Unemployment.....	16
Water compact.....	36
Water pollution.....	3
Water resources.....	31
Watersheds.....	1
Wheat agreement.....	8
Wilderness.....	5,40

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Humphrey commended United Nations approval of new international wheat agreement.

HOUSE

1. FLOOD PREVENTION. The Public Works Committee approved a work plan for Lick Creek watershed, Tenn., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to Appropriations Committee. p. 3375
2. PUBLIC DEBT; BUDGET. Rep. Vanik criticized the Federal Reserve for raising the interest rates and causing higher costs of obtaining money by the Government and private business. p. 3376
Rep. Budge urged a balanced budget in fiscal year 1960. pp. 3376-7
Rep. Alger inserted a letter urging Government economy. p. 3377
3. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Dingell inserted two statements showing how water pollution affects many people and urging action to combat the problem. pp. 3377-9

4. RESEARCH. Received from GSA a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research or tests for the 6-month period ended Dec. 31, 1958. p. 3385
5. WILDERNESS PRESERVATION. Received from the Utah Legislature a memorial opposing the wilderness preservation bills. p. 3387
6. HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4221, the Hawaiian Statehood bill. pp. D146, 3386
7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack stated that the Hawaiian Statehood bill and S. 79, relating to the coloring of oranges, would be considered on March 11. pp. 3384-5

SENATE

8. WHEAT AGREEMENT. Sen. Humphrey commended the approval of a new international wheat agreement by the United Nations Conference of Exporters and Importers, and inserted a newspaper article discussing the agreement. p. 3332
9. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Began debate on H. R. 2260, to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. pp. 3314, 3336-49, 3352-59, 3362-73
10. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Bush inserted an article, "Rural Electrification Subsidies," discussing the REA interest rate proposal and stating, "The controversy over President Eisenhower's plan to help balance the budget by eliminating the Federal interest rate subsidy to borrowers from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) provides a compelling illustration of how hard it is to withdraw Federal assistance once people have become used to it." pp. 3351-2
11. CHEESE. Sen. Wiley inserted a letter from the Wisc. Cheese Makers' Assoc. to the Secretary recommending the removal of cheeses from the list of price-supported commodities, and stated that he had called the Secretary's office regarding the matter and had been informed that "in the near future I would hear what was the Secretary's reaction to the letter." p. 3316
12. INFLATION. Sen. Butler discussed the danger of inflation, and stated that "More and more we are face to face with the fact that our price and wage structure is becoming less competitive in terms of world markets." pp. 3314-5
Sen. Smathers inserted an article, "Argument for Creeping Inflation," discussing the relationship between increased labor costs and productivity. pp. 3323-4
13. BUDGET. Sen. Byrd, Va., expressed concern over the effects of the proposed housing and airport construction bills on the Federal budget, and inserted tables showing probable expenditures under the bills if they are enacted. pp. 3324-5
14. ROADS. Sen. Cooper inserted an address before the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., discussing "the scope and adequacy of the Nation's highway programs." pp. 3326-7
15. RESEARCH; DISEASE. Sens. Neuberger and Humphrey urged that the U. S. assume international leadership in combating disease, and inserted several articles discussing this matter. pp. 3327-31

a leader for its passage—the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I, as the acting majority leader, will now ask for a quorum call, with the hope that at its conclusion we may have the yea and nay votes on the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will yield now for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. On the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very sorry I was unable to be present to hear what the Senator from Mississippi had to say; but, as I understand, when the original bill was enacted there was a provision placed in it whereby there would have to be an authorization each year for the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. STENNIS. An authorization each year; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us why that was necessary?

Mr. STENNIS. The provision was enacted in a supplemental appropriation bill. Public Law 85-766 has this paragraph:

No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any period prior to June 30, 1960, unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress.

As the Senator from Mississippi recalls, that provision was put in the law as a part of an agreement with the House. The amount to be appropriated last year was in disagreement. There was also disagreement on the provision of the Senate bill which required specific authorization for all appropriations to be made to the administration. It was suggested, as a part of an agreement by the conferees on a figure, that there would be no further appropriation except by express authorization, until June 30, 1960.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate insisted on that provision; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The Senate bill provided that all appropriations must be specifically authorized while the House bill contained no such requirement. It was agreed to compromise to require specific authorizations through June 30, 1960. This would permit ample time for further review of the desirability of making this authorization requirement a permanent one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the hope that after 1960 a general authorization will

be made for this agency, except for construction, which would be specifically authorized, so that it will be in the same category as any other arm of the armed services?

Mr. STENNIS. We are glad to have the Senator's interest shown. The entire matter will be taken up in the 1960 authorization bill. The committee expects to consider that very point.

Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. We have promised other Senators that if they would not speak we would have a vote.

Mr. BUSH. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Morton
Allott	Goldwater	Moss
Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Bartlett	Green	Murray
Beall	Gruening	Muskie
Bennett	Hart	Neuberger
Bible	Hartke	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Pastore
Bush	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hill	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Cannon	Humphrey	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Javits	Schoeppel
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Chavez	Keating	Smith
Church	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Dodd	McCarthy	Wiley
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McGee	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McNamara	Yarborough
Ellender	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Monroney	
Frear	Morse	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Joseph F. Guffey of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official

business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—91

Aiken	Fulbright	Morton
Allott	Goldwater	Moss
Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Bartlett	Green	Murray
Beall	Gruening	Muskie
Bennett	Hart	Neuberger
Bible	Hartke	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Pastore
Bush	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hill	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Cannon	Humphrey	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Javits	Schoeppel
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Chavez	Keating	Smith
Church	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Dodd	McCarthy	Wiley
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McGee	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McNamara	Yarborough
Ellender	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Monroney	
Frear	Morse	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—7

Case, N.J.	Jordan	Martin
Clark	Kefauver	
Hennings	Kerr	

So the bill (S. 1096) was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is unavoidably absent from the session today. Therefore, he could not be recorded when the vote was taken

on Senate bill 1096, the bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. However, if he had been present, he certainly would have supported the bill; and I should like to have that fact noted for the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 89, H.R. 2260, the draft extension bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1959" wherever such date appears therein and inserting "July 1, 1963" in lieu thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that several Senators desire to make statements. Then the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, will give an explanation of the bill. There will then be further discussion of the draft bill. The committee feels that a vote can be had on the bill this afternoon. There will be a quorum call before the vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the conclusion of action on the draft bill, it is planned to start the discussion of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

INFLATION, THE NATION'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for a few years after the end of World War II, the demands of the American market were so great that it was possible to raise costs and prices and still sell all the products our industry could produce.

Today, it is becoming increasingly clear that foreign competition is not only invading our overseas markets but is becoming an increasingly important factor in our domestic markets.

President Eisenhower in his Economic Report said:

It is not the function of Government in our society to establish the terms of con-

tracts between labor and management; yet it must be recognized that the public has a vital interest in these agreements. Increases in money wages and other compensation not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary. They impose severe hardships on those whose incomes are not enlarged. They jeopardize the capacity of the economy to create jobs for the expanding labor force. They endanger present jobs by limiting markets at home and impairing our capacity to compete in markets abroad. In short, they are, in the end, self-defeating.

Self-discipline and restraint are essential if agreements consistent with a reasonable stability of prices are to be reached within the framework of the free competitive institutions on which we rely heavily for the improvement of our material welfare. If the desired results cannot be achieved under our arrangements for determining wages and prices, the alternatives are either inflation, which would damage our economy and work hardships on millions of Americans, or controls, which are alien to our traditional way of life and which would be an obstacle to the Nation's economic growth and improvement.

In these statements when the President refers to productivity, he is referring to the productivity of the economy as a whole and not to the productivity of any particular firm or industry.

I have been greatly disturbed that in recent weeks many labor leaders have urged wage increases which they state would generate purchasing power for other industries. In effect, they suggest that we attempt to raise ourselves by our bootstraps.

More and more we are face to face with the fact that our price and wage structure is becoming less competitive in terms of world markets. Before this year is over the steel industry will once again negotiate a new contract with its employees.

Mr. President, two editorials from the magazine *American Metal Market* are worthy of the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *American Metal Market*, Jan. 28, 1959]

FRUSTRATING AND DISTURBING

There is something utterly frustrating and disturbing about the reaction in the highest echelons of organized labor to the President's Economic Message. With racketeers ensconced in high labor offices openly defying public indignation and arrogantly daring the Congress to do its damndest, and with demands for stratospheric wages and for basic hours that constitute little less than subsidized idleness, running almost rampant, one might have hoped for a different response to the President's urgent recommendations, from the more respected officials of the labor movement. The integrity of these latter officials is deservedly undisputed, but the irresponsibility of their criticism strongly suggests that the country may have more to fear from their sophistry than from the palpably unsavory elements who almost unfailingly overreach themselves.

All during the postwar years the country has heard business admonished on prices with as much or greater severity than labor has been urged to be temperate in its demands. In fact, the usual pattern has been for our highest officials to plead with busi-

ness and labor to be moderate—after labor has exacted concessions from business. This appearance of impartiality has inevitably misled millions to blame business alone for price increases. Among this unsuspecting multitude, labor has escaped even contributory responsibility for price increase, because labor has already got theirs before officialdom in Washington has expressed its concern, whereas the price increases forced by cost increases have followed the appeals.

A conspicuous example of a congressional contribution to this deceptive practice was the hearings held last spring in anticipation of steel price increases after last July 1. The investigators carefully ignored the scheduled substantial wage increase that was automatically to go into effect on that date, pursuant to the agreement of July-August, 1956. They also piously refused to consider the possible effects of the already-demanded wage increases in the automobile industry (which had not by then been granted) and which, if denied, would have deprived the industry of justification for the price increases of last fall that followed the ultimate granting of the uninvestigated wage demands.

This seeming immunity of labor to accountability for the effect of higher wage costs on the national economy would appear to have led the leaders of the labor movement to expect continuing exemption from official comment in advance of their obtaining current demands. Restrained as the President's admonition was, it has been bitterly resented, not only because it would obviously forestall the additional demands on industry that are clearly in the making, but because, at long last and for once, the President has sought to brake the inflation at its source, before the spiral is launched.

There will be virtually no one, outside the small circle of labor leaders and the advocates of some constant inflation, to dispute the fact that, in the effort to stop the corrosion of the dollar and the destruction of savings, "leaders of labor have a particularly critical role to play, in view of the great power lodged in their hands." Nor is it to be doubted by any impartial observer, that "the terms of agreements * * * will have a critical bearing * * * in attaining * * * economic growth with stable prices." Nor will any informed person be likely to dispute the assertion that "increases * * * not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary."

Yet the leadership of our most powerful unions declares that stable prices mean "stagnation and perhaps depression" and that the unions' drives for wage increases will go forward. Mr. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, has publicly appealed to the automobile industry to support his forthcoming demands, so as to provide his membership with \$1 billion to buy automobiles. Yet, if the past is any guide to the future, Mr. McDonald will hold that the steel industry will have no excuse to raise prices if it raises wages by \$1 billion. One marvels at the mental process which can conceive of an industry supplying another with \$1 billion of undiluted purchasing power without first having to earn it. Obviously, the application of this logic, by which wages would be arbitrarily raised in industry after industry to provide purchasing power for the goods of other industries, would soon reduce the value of the dollar to that of trading stamps.

In its arrogance, labor leadership has come to the stage where it preempts the right to tell management and industry to augment productivity by whatever margin is needed to compensate for the demands it chooses to impose from year to year. It not only assumes the capacity of management to accomplish this miracle, but it takes for granted labor's exclusive right to all the fruits of increased productivity (in practice

Attempts are being made to raise funds for the operations of the service, and some support has already been received from public spirited citizens in the Boston area. Further financial assistance from those interested in furthering our activities would be welcomed.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?

If you have any questions concerning the Vienna Youth Festival or desire further information about it, please communicate with the service at its Cambridge offices. We will be pleased to place you on our mailing lists to receive items appropriate to your interest.

EXHIBIT 2

The attempt of the Russian Government to use the Youth Festival for propaganda turned out to be far more subtle than we had first anticipated. Past youth festivals had been very carefully calculated propaganda efforts against the West—and the United States in particular. In 1947 and 1949, the theme was antifascism; in 1951 and 1953 the festival passed resolutions condemning "United States aggression and germ warfare in Korea"; in 1955 at Warsaw, the pitch was peaceful coexistence. Peaceful coexistence was again the main theme of the Youth Festival this year. But resolutions were incidental to demonstrations of peace and friendship. Everywhere the delegates went thousands of Russians greeted them with flowers and gifts and apparently genuine affection.

It became obvious to us that the Russian Government was directing its greatest effort toward the African and colonial countries, and the Arab nations. For instance, many of the large Russian stores had set up display windows. The clothing dummies were always mixed white and Negro and carefully arranged in each window. Dummies of black-skinned children were used to display the best of Soviet youth wearing apparel, and display windows for the most expensive women's clothes all had at least one Negro dummy. One of the most spectacular displays in Moscow was of a giant magic carpet about 30 feet above one of Moscow's largest squares. On the magic carpet were three model children, arm in arm: a Negro child, a Caucasian child, and a child representing the yellow race.

The dark-skinned and the Arab delegates to the festival seemed to be given special treatment by the Russian crowds and officials. These delegates were deluged with flowers and gifts, and were carefully shepherded to numerous meetings along with other supposedly exploited people. Although every delegation was given the red-carpet treatment, the colonials found themselves living in somewhat better conditions. Instead of five to a room (in the American and British hostels), the Indians and Africans and Arabs were put in rooms with two or three people. Instead of cafeteria-type, self-service meals, the Russians gave the delegates of the uncommitted countries their own dining halls and waiters and candlelight service. The rooms of each of these delegations were equipped with telephones.

Most of the Indian delegates to whom I spoke saw through this preferential treatment. A good many of them laughed and joked over the whole thing and explained that I too could be better treated if I would only give up my American citizenship and become an Indian or an African. But undoubtedly all the Soviet efforts along this line were not in vain. It is pretty hard to forget the almost hysterical screaming of the Syrian and Egyptian delegations every time the opportunity came to praise Russia and the Russian leaders. Or the way the Arab delegates prostrated themselves before Khrushchev and the Presidium on the day of the opening ceremonies. The chant of

"Syria and Russia, friendship forever," echoed throughout Moscow wherever the Syrian delegation went.

In many respects I was impressed with the careful, methodical planning and general organization of the Youth Festival activities. Thirty thousand young people from all over the world and all speaking different languages poured into Moscow. One hundred thousand youths were brought to Moscow from all parts of the Soviet Union. All of these people had to be housed, fed, transported around the city. Although there were a number of mixups and sometimes complete confusion, by and large, the Russians were able to run the whole production smoothly.

It might be worthwhile to note that the Russians were able to find top-rate interpreters for each language spoken by the festival delegates. Not one, but several. I asked some of the Russians whether it was difficult to find interpreters for some of the dialects and lesser known languages. The answer was no. "We make sure that we have enough people studying all the different languages to provide for our language needs whenever such things as the Youth Festival come up." "But suppose you have no students who want to study a particular dialect?" I asked. "We find them," came back the answer.

The food problem at the festival must have been immense. The Russians provided from three to five main courses for each meal. One course was always served for vegetarians. Arabs received food in line with their national eating habits; Chinese food was available, and so on down the line.

The problem of equitably providing tickets for the cultural performances during the festival was gigantic. Thirty thousand foreign youths and 100,000 young Russians were in Moscow all clamoring to be entertained. Thirty, 40 or 50 theaters would be in operation in one night, and somehow each would be filled to capacity with festival delegates. Mistakes were made in the ticket allocations, but the big surprise was the apparent ease with which this difficult problem was handled.

Sometimes, however, the Soviet technical and organization competence fell down completely. The most serious example of this from the Russian point of view was the carefully ballyhooed evening demonstration on Hiroshima Day. The Russians were quite obviously planning to make their big propaganda push of the festival. "American mass murder" was one term being bandied about as the big rally drew near.

But the rally was a complete failure. The Russians made several crucial mistakes in its staging. For some reason they decided to make it a rally of only youth delegates to the festival. Cordons of police were set up to keep the Russian people out. This was a festival rally, they explained. The sudden shift from 10 days of howling masses of people to the comparatively few festival delegates put a real damper on festivities.

The total cost of the festival to the Russian Government has been estimated at anywhere from \$20 million to \$200 million. The most reliable figure seems to be somewhat in the neighborhood of \$125 million. The bulk of this money went into building construction, housing facilities, and food transportation, and entertainment. From all accounts in the Russian press since the Youth Festival, it seems pretty apparent that the Russian Government is having a good many qualms as to whether the money was well spent or not. Russian youth leaders have had to issue statements telling the young people of Russia to throw off the subversive ideas spread at the festival by non-Communist delegates, to ignore the lies spread by certain youth delegates, and to join together once again in their full support of the Communist Party and the Soviet leaders. Hitherto taboo

subjects have found their way into the Soviet press, such as the defection of Howard Fast from the Communist Party and the contents of the United Nations Report on Hungary.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. HENRY L. J. MAY, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have with us on the floor of the Senate a very distinguished visitor. At this time I present to the Senate Hon. Henry L. J. May, a Member of the Parliament of New Zealand. Mr. May is the Chief Government Whip in the Parliament of New Zealand. He is chairman of the Parliament's Local Bills Committee, and also a member of the Committee on External Affairs, which corresponds to our Foreign Relations Committee.

It is a pleasure to have Mr. May with us, and I am delighted to present him to the Senate at this time. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement prepared in the Office of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor containing a brief biography of our distinguished visitor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Henry L. J. May is visiting the United States as a participant in the foreign leader program of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. The Office of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor has been assigned responsibility for his program.

Mr. May is a Labor Party Member of Parliament, and has been for approximately 5 years. He is a member of the National Executive for the New Zealand Labor Party. Mr. May is president of the Wellington, Nelson, Westland, and Marlborough local bodies, other laborers, and related trades industrial union of workers. He has been a borough councilor and a member of a river and valley power board. He has been associated with the New Zealand railroads for approximately 18 years. Mr. May has also been very active in sports and belongs to a number of sporting clubs, such as rifle shooting, football, and tennis. He is a member of the National Geographic Society. Mr. May is chief government whip, chairman of the Parliament's local bills committee, and a member of the committee on external affairs. He has acted as chairman of some of the most important committees of the New Zealand labor conferences.

Mr. May is keenly interested in studying various aspects of U.S. Federal, State, and municipal government. He is particularly interested in all aspects of the political scene; for example, the methods used for running for office, and the organization and methods of Congress, especially the administration, functions, and authority of congressional committees. Because of his long association with administration of his borough, he would like to see as much as possible of American practices in traffic control, laws and codes, public transport, housing administration, soil conservation, irrigation, and fire department organization. As a member of Parliament representing the interests of his constituents and an industrial and manufacturing area that is growing fast, he would like to learn about something of union attitudes

toward automation, the meatpacking industry, methods of attracting industry, and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. He would like to visit one or two automated plants.

As a framework to his particular purposes, Mr. May is generally interested in the recreational, cultural, social, political, and economic aspects of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, H.R. 2260, involves a 4-year extension of five separate authorities, all of which relate to the maintenance of the strength and health of the Armed Forces of the United States. I should like to discuss each one of the five authorities briefly; then I shall be glad to yield for questions concerning the bill.

REGULAR DRAFT

The first and perhaps the most important objective of the bill is to extend the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces. Unless extended this authority would expire on July 1 of this year. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension, until July 1, 1963.

Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act young men must register with their local boards at the age of 18, although they are not liable for induction until they reach the age of 18½. After registration these young men are classified by their local boards. Unless they are eligible for the various deferments and exemptions authorized under the basic law, the young men are classified I-A. Persons classified I-A are called in a sequence that results in the induction principally of nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26. Draft calls presently are relatively low. Approximately 115,000 men will be inducted during the current fiscal year, and over the next 4 fiscal years annual inductions are estimated to average 90,000. The current average age at induction is about 22½, and over the next 4 years this average age probably will increase to 23.

Under existing conditions only the Army requires inductees, but the existence of the draft machinery operates as a powerful inducement to enlistments in the other Armed Forces.

More than 1,200,000 young men will reach the age of 18½ during each of the

next 4 years. This fact coupled with the relatively low rate of inductions has caused some observers to believe that the manpower pool is excessive and that many young men are reaching the age of 26 without having performed military service. A comprehensive study conducted by the Department of Defense and participated in by other Federal agencies having manpower responsibilities tends to counter such an impression. The results of this study, which are discussed in the committee report, show that only a negligible number of qualified nonfathers have avoided military service or are likely to avoid military service by 1963.

Although this result may seem paradoxical, it is understandable when one analyzes the manpower supply in any particular age group. It must be remembered that, in addition to the approximately 100,000 inductions, about 400,000 other young men enlist in one or another of the Armed Forces. Another large chunk of a year group is made up of fathers. Still another explanation is the high rate of rejection for failure to meet mental and physical qualifications. The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent of all registrants.

Before giving the committee justification for extending the draft authority, I should like to discuss the other authorities included in the bill.

SELECTIVE CALLS FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Despite some special inducements for physicians and dentists, the Department of Defense has been unable to recruit enough Regular doctors and dentists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. For this reason, it is necessary to provide for the temporary service of a sufficient number of doctors and dentists to bridge the gap between the numbers of Regulars and the requirements of the Department.

Persons deferred under the Universal Military Training and Service Act remain liable for induction until they reach the age of 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur a liability for induction until age 35.

Originally there was no authority to select persons for induction on the basis of their professional abilities or skills. When world conditions required the Government to summon increasing numbers of men to the colors, they could not be called from their homes and placed in the Armed Forces without being afforded adequate medical and dental care. The necessity for that care required that unusual steps be taken.

To permit such selective induction without also inducting unneeded persons, a 1957 act authorized the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists. This law also provided authority for ordering physicians and dentists who were members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they had not al-

ready served on active duty for at least 1 year.

The combination of authority for selective induction of physicians and dentists and the authority for ordering Reserve physicians and dentists to active duty has caused this special authority to operate by indirection. No inductions have been made under this authority because the physicians and dentists who are subject to it have accepted Reserve commissions and have been ordered to active duty as needed. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension of this special authority to induct physicians and dentists and to order Reserve physicians and dentists to active duty for 24 months.

Despite the fact that the strengths of the Regular medical and dental corps have increased in each of the three military departments, about 50 percent of all physicians and about 60 percent of all dentists on active duty on June 30, 1959, are noncareer officers. If this special authority is permitted to expire, it will unquestionably reduce to unacceptable levels the number of physicians and dentists on active duty.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

Another feature of the bill is a proposed 4-year extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

This act was approved in 1950, and had as its purpose the authorization of dependency allowances that were necessary under the peacetime structure of the Armed Forces.

The peacetime policy of the Armed Forces would not involve acceptance by persons with dependents of enlistments in the lower three pay grades and a part of the fourth. Since persons with dependents were not enlisted in these lower pay grades, there was no authorization to pay a quarters allowance to them. The partial mobilization, following hostilities in Korea, required the utilization on active duty of members of the lower pay grades, even though they had dependents. Consequently, the Congress in 1950 prescribed a system of quarters allowances for all enlisted grades. These allowances are graduated according to grade, and they are somewhat more liberal than the allowances provided under the permanent law, even for the persons who are entitled to quarters allowances under the permanent provisions of the Career Compensation Act. At a time when it is important to emphasize voluntary enlistments, it obviously is necessary to continue provisions for dependency allowances for all of the enlisted grades.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Another of the authorities contained in House bill 2260 would continue in effect a suspension of ceilings on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

The permanent authorization of the Armed Forces total somewhat more than 2 millions persons, but less than the active duty strength of the Armed Forces today or at any time since 1950. These ceilings have been suspended since 1950; and I am sure that the necessity for continuing the suspension is apparent to

everyone who has any familiarity with the conditions which exist today.

The Air Force furnishes a good illustration of the necessity for continuing suspension of these ceilings. The permanent personnel authorization of the Air Force is 502,000. It is estimated that its strength on June 30 of this year will be about 850,000. Failure to continue this suspension would result in a loss of almost 350,000 members of the Air Force. Of course, Mr. President, such a condition as that is unthinkable.

For the period that the permanent limitations are suspended, a secondary ceiling of 5 million persons on the total personnel of the Armed Forces comes into play. This secondary limitation will be effective during the period of suspension of the permanent limitations involved in this bill. Of course, in the light of the present strength of our Military Establishment, that limitation is not likely to come into effect.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

The committee has amended the bill by adding to it a legislative proposal by the Department of Defense that continues eligibility for special pay by physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1959.

In an attempt to procure more physicians and dentists, and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, there has been in effect for several years a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with the length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty as such officers are eligible for special pay of \$100 a month. Those with more than 2, but less than 6, years of service are eligible for \$150. Those with more than 6, but less than 10, years of such service are eligible for \$200 a month. Those with more than 10 years may receive \$250 a month. Veterinarians are eligible for \$10 a month in special pay, irrespective of their length of service.

Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians already on active duty, or entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, would continue to receive this special pay, even if this amendment were not adopted. The amendment is offered to permit those officers in these categories who enter on active duty between July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1963, to be eligible for these special payments in the same manner and amount that officers already on active duty are now eligible.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE BILL

Mr. President, in 1948 we could not raise the strength of the Armed Forces to 2 million men without having a selective service or draft law in operation. Today, the active duty strength of the Armed Forces is more than 2,500,000. In today's troubled world we simply cannot risk a reduction in this strength that unquestionably would result if the authority to induct were not extended.

Of course, there is nothing sacrosanct about the 4-year period of extension. However, the last two extensions of this

authority have been for 4 years; and I regret to say that I see nothing that would support a hope that we may dispense with the draft within the next 4 years. Since this is true, Mr. President, I believe that a shorter extension would only offer a false hope to some young men, and perhaps it would cause them to plan unrealistically for their future.

The committee has had some earnest suggestions from church groups that the draft should be stopped. While conceding their good faith, I confess that I am unable to understand their reasoning. The Communists admittedly are atheistic. In my opinion, failure to extend the draft would make this country most vulnerable to the onslaught of atheistic communism. Until the Communists demonstrate some of the same religious characteristics that we are urged to show by those who would suppress and stop the operation of the draft, I think that failure to extend the draft would tend to suppress a religious outlook, instead of strengthening such an outlook.

Nor have I been impressed by the argument that uncertainties about when a young man will enter the service are contributing to confusion of and delinquencies by our youth. Whatever the defects of the present system may be, and I would be the first to concede that there are defects in the system—it certainly offers a wide choice to the young men vulnerable for the draft. There are more than 30 ways in which a young man may discharge his military obligations to his country. There is a wide variety of choice of branch of service, as well as a choice as to whether the person will enlist in the regular forces or in the Reserve forces, and also as to the length of his total service.

For young persons who desire to complete college before discharging their military obligations, this opportunity exists, since the average age of induction is now about 22½. For those who desire to discharge their obligation before attending college, this opportunity also exists. These persons may volunteer for induction, or they may enter one of the 6-month training programs. For those who are seriously disturbed about the uncertainty, I would suggest that they consider the wide variety of choices available to all young men who desire to discharge their military obligation to their country.

I also should like to disabuse some persons of an impression that military service is in some way degrading or that it tends to militarize our youth. The many millions of veterans in our society today completely refute these contentions. Anyone who has any apprehension that men who have served in the military forces are likely to produce a military dictatorship in this country have only to talk to those completing their military duties to find that, instead of giving him any such impression as that, he will find they are more devoted than ever to the idea of civilian control of our Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I would urge the responsible community, church, and civic leaders to emphasize the opportunity

and privilege of participating in the defense of this country, instead of harping on the inconvenience and disadvantages of military service. This country cannot survive in today's troubled world without determination and a willingness on the part of our people to make some sacrifice. I believe there is need for a renewed awareness that military service is necessary. Mr. President, I believe that in today's world, when all that we have and hold dear is threatened, there should be a feeling of pride in being able to render military service, instead of considering it as something to be avoided as if it were a disease or a plague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the senior member of the Armed Services Committee on this side of the aisle, I want to join with the chairman of the committee in supporting the position of the committee in extending the Draft Act or the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

The committee has recommended that the bill be passed, with no amendments or changes in the present law, for 4 years. In other words, the committee has recommended the continuation of the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

The committee has recommended the continuation for 4 years of the provisions relating to doctors, dentists, and veterinarians, with increased salaries.

The committee has recommended the continuation for 4 years of the provision relating to dependents.

The committee has eliminated for 4 years the ceilings which may be placed on the size of the Armed Forces.

As the chairman of the committee has so well pointed out, we need the benefits and the provisions of this act in order to maintain the strength of our armed services. Many volunteers are obtained for service in our Armed Forces, but we must not deceive ourselves into believing that the Armed Forces would obtain all those volunteers if there were not in effect the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Undoubtedly there will be questions asked of the chairman of the committee as to why the committee did not adopt a particular amendment or amendments which had been recommended. The difficulty with amending the Selective Service Act, as I see it, is that we could not tell what the effect would be if an amendment of the law were adopted, and that if the committee adopted one amendment, it might only be fair to adopt several more.

The committee decided that, as long as the act had been administered in a fairly satisfactory manner, it should be continued. Of course, the administration of the act has not been entirely satisfactory, because no compulsory law of that kind will ever be administered in an entirely satisfactory manner. We believed that there was involved a question of administration of the act rather than a need for a change in the law.

As General Hershey pointed out in his testimony, in his work as head of the

Selective Service System there have been many administrative changes made since the original Selective Service Act was put into operation. Those changes have affected very considerably the responsibilities of the young men who have gone into the military service, the time they would spend in the service, and many other matters. As General Hershey stated to the committee, if conditions change again, as they have changed from time to time, the law is sufficiently flexible so changes can be made in an administrative way.

I would say the chairman of the committee has stated accurately the general opinion among the committee members that the act should be extended for 4 years rather than 2 years, because there will be no change in conditions that we can foresee which would allow us to eliminate the law at the end of 2 years. So it was thought wiser to extend the law for 4 years rather than 2 years.

As the senior member of the committee on this side of the aisle, I join with the chairman of the committee in recommending and hoping that the Senate will pass the bill without amendment. In my opinion, that will be the fairest way to pass the bill and the fairest way that an act of this character can be administered. Any law which is compulsory as regards young men cannot, of course, be entirely fair to all of them, and it is not fair to all. However, it is the best we can do in the way of legislation, so long as a Selective Service Act is required.

I am happy to join the Senator from Georgia for the second time, since he and I have been working on the committee, in urging that the law be extended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee, and who, in those unfortunate periods when the Republican Party was in the majority, served as chairman of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At that time the Senator from Massachusetts was ably assisted by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am always glad to help the Senator from Massachusetts. If there has ever been any partisanship in this committee in either administration, I have not seen it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Massachusetts has just stated, the pending measure contains no substantive change in the act which is now in effect, and no amendments to the act, as such, were considered by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee considered some amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Georgia will remember that prior to his committee's consideration of the measure I spoke to him, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in an effort to have him accept an amendment fixing the strength

of the Army at not less than 900,000 men, which would retain the Army at its current strength and would not necessitate the closing of any Army installation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana did discuss that matter with me. He of course knows that the Senate had adopted a provision for 900,000 men in the Appropriations Act for the current fiscal year, and that there had been a difference of opinion between the legislative and the executive branch as to what the size of the Army should be. There had never before been substantive legislation fixing a finite floor on the strength of an armed force.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator stated to me at the time of the discussion that that had never been done in the past, and he did not believe it was practical to amend the act at this time in order to fix a floor for the number of men in the Army. Therefore, upon learning of Senator RUSSELL's position on this matter, I saw no future in pursuing this tack.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has quoted me almost verbatim. I made that statement. I still think it would be unfortunate and an unwise thing to undertake to do so in the legislation now being considered. We are having enough difficulty at present in holding the Army at its present strength, without endangering the proposal by inviting a veto. The Army can still further shrink below its present size.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator stated, this entire problem was discussed before the Senate Committee on Appropriations last year, and the Committee on Appropriations went on record as stating that in its opinion, a 900,000-man Army, at least, was necessary for the protection of the country. Pursuant to that viewpoint, we provided sufficient funds to maintain a 900,000-man Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is one of the senior members of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the most active members of that committee. The Senator has correctly stated that the committee last year approved appropriations for an army of 900,000 men. The Senate, as I recall, confirmed that act without any substantial discussion. The appropriations for an army of 900,000 men were actually made.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, I believe the Senator will recall that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina presented an amendment to the bill to fix the Army at 900,000 men and the Senate subsequently adopted this amendment unanimously. However, when the matter was taken to conference, the House refused to accept the mandatory Army limit placed in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The size of the Military Establishment in this country historically has been fixed in the appropriation bills rather than in other legislation. When the Armed Services Committee considers personnel strengths it usually establishes an authorization or a ceiling, which is based upon the testimony in

the hearings before the committee. However, as between one man and the ceiling, whatever it may be, the number is fixed by the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from South Carolina did offer such an amendment, which would have placed language in the law that the Active Army should be not less than 900,000, and the Senate approved the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, when the bill went to conference, the other body was adamant in opposition to the amendment. It so happens I was one of the conferees on the bill, and the House refused to accept the amendment, so the Senate was compelled to yield on that very wise provision.

However, the Senate did not abandon the position completely, because the committee on conference did state that the Army strength should be 900,000. It was the position of the other body that the matter had been handled historically in the conference report. Strong language was placed in the conference report, but that clear intent has been disregarded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator and would like to point out that, specifically, the will of Congress has been disregarded by the President.

Does the Senator know of any manner in which now or in the near future we could present a measure which would compel the President, at least, to recognize that the Congress has something to say and to do about fixing a minimum size for the Army? Certainly, considering all the information which was presented for the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished majority leader and by others, there is an indication to me that under the Constitution the Congress has the power to raise and support armies. Considering the facts brought before us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it strikes me that a powerful case has been made for a larger Army than has been ordered by the President. Yet we are confronted with this direct opposition to the wishes of Congress from the President. I wonder if the distinguished Senator will comment on this.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, of course, realize how keenly the Senator from Louisiana feels that the Army should be maintained at not less than 900,000 men, because I have heard him discuss the matter in the committee, as well as in the conferences he has held with me in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator, of course, knows this is not a new issue. There have been questions between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government for more than a century—for almost a century and a half—with respect to the appropriations which have been made by the Congress, when the Executive has not thought it wise or prudent to make the expenditures. Very frankly, I know of no recourse which the legislative branch of the Government has in such a situation as that, unless the situation is so bad that the Congress feels it is justified in resorting to the impeachment

powers which are conferred on the legislative branch in the Constitution of the United States. Otherwise, we have no powers that would compel the President of the United States to spend any appropriations made for the Armed Forces.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we realize impeachment is manifestly impossible. There is a difference now between Congress and the executive branch. I do not question the good faith of the Executive. I know the Congress is acting in good faith.

This is not a new question. Other Senators in other days have sought to devise ways and means to require an Executive to carry out the intent of Congress as to the expenditure of funds. So far as I am advised, none of them have ever succeeded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am aware of what has happened in the past, I will say to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the President is willing to take the responsibility before the people of the country for refusing to spend the funds, it does not seem that much can be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have stated, I am aware of that, and that is why I discussed with my good friend from Georgia the possibility of getting something done by the Armed Services Committee which would compel the President to maintain an Army of 900,000 men.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we provided the money, action still would not be required, I will say. That would not strengthen what the Congress did last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was reassured by the statement of the distinguished Senator that no substantial change has been recommended in the existing law. Do I correctly understand that the provisions of the existing law provide that the Governors of the respective States shall name the Directors of Selective Service in their States and shall name the members of the local draft boards; and that those provisions are to continue?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Florida well knows that under the law the President appoints the State Directors on the recommendation of the Governors. The President appoints the local boards but on the recommendation of the Governors. That has been the case since the first Selective Service Act was passed, I believe in 1939. That system will be carried over in the extension, if the Congress sees fit to extend the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is a very important part of the law, and I am sure the chairman of the committee agrees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not agree more. There have been injustices in regard to certain individual draft boards, but there has been a feeling on the part of all the young men in this Nation that their cases have been considered by neighbors in the community. I think that has had a beneficial effect. It is one of the things which dramatizes the difference between selective service as applied

in a democracy such as ours and as applied in a military system such as obtained in Prussia, or in Germany. The question of passing upon deferments is taken to the grass roots, and the many human elements enter into the question of when and how the military service is to be rendered. It is one of those things which cause me to believe there is no need to be worried about Prussianization or militarization of this country so long as we keep the program so close to the people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not agree more heartily with the distinguished Senator than upon the last statement. I think the details which we have just discussed help to give the earmarks of democracy to selective service in a way which could not be accomplished otherwise.

I have one more question to ask the Senator on that subject. Will the discretionary powers of the local boards be affected or diminished in any way by the proposed extension?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are not touched at all by the proposed extension. Frankly, they very largely grew out of regulations under the law, rather than the law itself. This bill in no wise affects the present powers or discretion of the local boards. There is some variety in the application of the law. Some boards do not hesitate to draft young men who are married. Others give them deferment under the regulations. The discretionary powers represent an intangible, related to the community rather than to the hard and fast letter of the regulations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Speaking for one Senator—and I think I speak the sentiments of a great many others—I am happy that the responsibility in this vastly important matter in our republic rests in hands so capable and so patriotic as those of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who speaks for Senators on this side of the aisle, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who speaks for Senators on the other side of the aisle. We know with what complete patriotism these questions are handled. We compliment those two distinguished Senators, as well as every other member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I would not like to have this occasion pass without saying that the committee is very fortunate in the caliber of its staff. It is not a large staff, but it is very able and efficient.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. First, let me join other Senators in paying my respects to the distinguished chairman of the committee. There is no person in Government service for whom I have greater admiration and respect.

I should like to ask the Senator a question on the subject of deferment and

exemptions. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that it might be desirable to have a committee of Congress, or perhaps a joint committee, enter into some study of this subject during the next 2 or 3 years, to see if there is some way by which we can bring about more of an organized pattern to insure that every young man performs some useful service, rather than having large numbers of qualified men escape service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that the idea that a large number of qualified men escape service is not well founded. The President has raised the mental standards. Testimony before the committee was to the effect that not more than 1 in 10 qualified young men in this country have avoided military service. About 45 percent are not qualified, either for physical reasons or because their aptitude is not adequate to qualify them. However, about 9 out of 10 of those who are qualified have rendered military service to the country.

There have been inequities, and we have conducted a number of studies. The Senator from Louisiana is a former member of the committee. He was a very active and useful member of the committee. He will recall that a commission was appointed to deal with this subject. When it was first established it was presided over by former Senator Wadsworth, of New York, who was an expert in that field. Later General Sarnoff was Chairman of the Commission. It held lengthy hearings and filed a large number of reports and recommendations dealing with this subject.

Many commissions have studied this field. Of course, we have improved the machinery. It is much better than it was in the early stages. We learned as we went along.

We also discussed in the committee the desirability of having a subcommittee that would consider this question very closely, as well as the question of utilization of military manpower. It is always a difficult problem to determine the best utilization of the manpower we now have.

Mr. LONG. One point which occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana is the fact that the people of this Nation are weak in the understanding of foreign languages. The Armed Forces have a good language school. However, I noticed, in visiting Russia, that that nation exempts certain young men from service in the armed forces in order to permit them to go to language schools. They concentrate on the study of languages, to the extent that large numbers of their people are trained to speak foreign languages very fluently. It seems to me that that is one area in which this Nation is not laying the proper stress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that I held the same opinion. However, at the present time the armed services have a better record with respect to teaching attachés the languages of other countries than has the State Department.

One can go to almost any country, including Finland, Russia, Sweden, and other countries which have difficult languages, and find that the Army attachés

speaking the various languages fluently, because they are given very rigid indoctrination in the language for 6 or 8 months. They may not be as fluent as they might be, but they understand the language, and they can make themselves understood. I think the armed services are improving in that respect much faster than is the State Department.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct. But, to offset some of the glaring weaknesses in the State Department, it seems to me that if the armed services could train a considerable number of their members to speak foreign languages, there would be a wider reservoir from which the State Department might draw subsequently.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree entirely. As a member of the Board of Visitors to various service academies, I have discussed that subject. There has been great improvement in the language courses available in the service schools, and in the schools operated by the services. If I were as well satisfied with the progress we are making in all other branches of the military service as I am with the teaching of languages to the men who are to serve as military attachés overseas, I would be much more optimistic. I believe the improvement has been most spectacular in the past 5 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With relation to the State Department, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I have joined for several years in trying to stimulate a greater degree of language study in the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department.

With relation to the armed services, I agree with what the chairman has said. In the service academies as much time is now devoted to the humanities as it is possible to give, when we consider all the science studies which must be pursued.

With relation to the men brought into the armed services, I believe I am correct in saying—although I am not sure of the accuracy of the statement—that there are opportunities for language studies in almost any place where a man may be situated, if he wishes to pursue such studies. It is on a voluntary basis.

The armed services are making an excellent record. The State Department can do better. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I express the hope that the Senator from Louisiana will support the bill of the Senator from Montana and myself.

Mr. LONG. It does seem to me that, in the national interest, something must be done toward providing better qualifications generally in the language field for our Foreign Service. Perhaps it might be well to consider at some time in the future means by which it would be possible to work out some kind of deferment or even exemption for those who are attempting to qualify themselves for the Foreign Service, so that we may have available persons in the diplomatic service, who, with their knowledge of foreign languages, will help avert war, if

that is possible—and to help win it if we must fight it.

It seems to me that some kind of deferment or even exemption should be provided for persons who are willing to develop a knowledge of foreign languages.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is possible to do that under existing law. It is possible under existing law to give a deferment. A very liberal system of deferment is available for students in colleges who wish to study foreign languages, as well as many other courses, as long as they maintain certain grades and do a certain amount of work in those fields.

The Senator is undoubtedly correct, that this is one of our great weaknesses in our battle to win the minds and hearts of men. The Russians have a tremendous advantage over us in that regard. He and I have traveled in Russia, and no doubt he has been amazed by the number of people in Russia, many of whom have never traveled outside their little home communities, who can speak a foreign language.

Mr. LONG. It is worse than amazing; it is distressing.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is certainly very impressive on the visitor. Russian children must study a foreign language, and must begin the study of a foreign language in what is the equivalent of our second, third, and fourth grades. That is when they must begin their study of a foreign language.

When I was in Russia, I was told that before World War II, the German language had been the favorite foreign language. Now, since the war, and since the expansion of their language courses, English has become the most popular language study in the Russian schools.

The Russians not only train people in a particular language, but also in the various dialects of a language. There is no place in the world, regardless of what its language or the dialect of the language may be, into which the Russians cannot send a qualified person who is capable of speaking that language and dialect, so that he can converse with those people. That is giving the Russians a tremendous advantage over our country. That situation certainly should be corrected, and I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. I should now like to ask a question or two along the line of the questions asked by my senior colleague from Louisiana. I should like to ask first a question relating to the proposed cutback in the military strength, which, I believe, would amount to about 30,000 in the Army and about 20,000 in the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. About 25,000 in the Marine Corps and 30,000 in the Army. That is what is proposed to be done at the moment, but I understand that consideration has been given to a larger cut.

Mr. LONG. Do I understand that under the proposed Army cutback, the Army would lose one full division? I understand that at the present time we have two divisions in the Far East and about five divisions in Europe. I also understand that we have divisions which are now training in this country, and that those divisions will rotate with the

divisions in foreign areas when trained. However, I understand that that leaves only about two trained divisions in the United States as of now. I should like to know if that is also the understanding of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There will be one less division in the U.S. Army when the reduction is effectuated. I understand that the division will be taken from what is called the STRAC, the strategic reserve of the Army, which has been composed of four divisions. It would be reduced by one division if the reduction is made.

Mr. LONG. So far as I am able to determine, my impression at the moment is that if we look at the Reserves in this country which would be available to go to an area of disturbance, we would have only two or three divisions in this country which could be sent, let us say, to Europe, if trouble should break out there, or to Asia, or wherever trouble might arise, based upon our present reserves. Is that in accord with the Senator's understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt that in this country we have more than two divisions which are fully trained and equipped and ready to go at the present time. A third division is somewhat less ready.

Mr. LONG. That is, in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be another one. There are other divisions, but they are largely training cadres. I know of no divisions as such other than the two the Senator has in mind that would be ready to go.

Mr. LONG. The point I have in mind is that the proposed cutback in the Army strength may well mean, if it is made, a reduction of 30 or 50 percent of the actual available reserves which could be shifted to wherever trouble may arise.

Mr. RUSSELL. From within this country; yes.

Mr. LONG. That is my impression.

Mr. RUSSELL. At least 25 percent, I will say.

Mr. LONG. That is a very serious reduction in our ready reserve, which must back up our forces in position in the event trouble breaks out.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator well knows that Congress has consistently refused to put all of its Congressional eggs into the massive retaliation basket or in the Strategic Air Command. We have supported the Strategic Air Command at a strength greater than requested in the budget. At the same time we have been apprehensive about the danger of a war less than total war breaking out. Such a development would require considerable ground forces. All I can do is try to imagine what a potential enemy would do, and I try to consider what I would do if I were in his place.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator shares my hope that the United States will not find itself in such a position that our only recourse will be to engage in an all-out thermonuclear war. In other words, if we run into trouble in Berlin or in the Middle East or in Korea, I would hope that we would not find ourselves in the position where our only

course would be to engage in thermo-nuclear warfare.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would certainly hope so. I will give another illustration of what I have in mind. If the Russians were to pull back 25 miles from around Berlin, and the East German forces were to undertake to blockade all the means of ingress and egress to and from Berlin, I do not know exactly how we could use nuclear weapons to resolve that difficulty. Would we attack the East Germans or would we attack the Russians, who had pulled back and had disengaged?

Somehow we would have to get into Berlin to feed the people or to rescue them or to relieve them. The principal way we could do that would be with our Army on the ground. I do not believe that nuclear superiority would function under that assumed situation any more than it did in Korea.

Mr. LONG. The Secretary of Defense appeared on a television program over the weekend, and he laid great stress on the fact that if trouble broke out in the world, we could rely on our allies, and that with their divisions, plus our divisions, we would have a considerable force in the area.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Secretary of Defense suggest how long it would take France to get its army out of Algeria?

Mr. LONG. No; he did not dwell on that point at the time. However, if this Nation is to make a reduction of a full division in its Armed Forces, I wonder what the effect would be on the French, the West Germans, the Belgians, the Dutch, the English, and our other allies, who are in the affected area, and how we can expect them to maintain their forces in readiness.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has not mentioned what distresses me even more than that, and that is the effect it would have on the men in the Kremlin, particularly as to whether they will believe we are serious in our talk at a time when we are reducing our military forces. That is what concerns me most of all.

Mr. LONG. That very much concerns the junior Senator from Louisiana also. I wish to explore a matter of congressional policy with the Senator from Georgia. I doubt that he need look at the manual to answer this question. I am referring to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have the power to lay taxes, and so forth. I skip to the provision: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a Navy." My interpretation of that constitutional provision is that Congress shall have the power to raise and support an Army and Navy in addition to its power over the purse strings, because in the beginning of the section reference is made to laying taxes to provide for the common defense. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia interprets that section the way I do, namely, that it means that it is both the duty and the responsibility of Congress to raise and support an Army and a Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion there is no question that that is the responsi-

bility of Congress. It is my belief that when the Founding Fathers were writing the Constitution, they intended to entrust to Congress the responsibility of determining the size of the Military Establishment. In the division of powers, they gave to the President of the United States the power of the Commander in Chief over whatever Army and Navy Congress raised. They divided the powers in that fashion, so that the Commander in Chief would not have complete control over the size of the Armed Forces, because they were opposed to a military regime in this country and to the complete seizure of power by one man.

I interpret the Constitution just as it is written. That Congress has the power to maintain a military establishment, to provide for it, and to provide for the means to establish the size of it. But it has not always worked out that way.

Mr. LONG. The last Congress appropriated money, and the committee report contained language indicating that the purpose of the money was to maintain a 900,000-man Army. I heard the Secretary of Defense explain his view of that matter on the television program on Sunday. He said he regarded it as a mere invitation to the Executive to provide more defense than the Executive cared to provide, in the event the Executive was so disposed.

It seems to me that if Congress should write into some particular bill—an appropriate one, I would hope—language requiring the Executive to maintain a certain sized Army or Navy, since Congress clearly has the duty to raise and support an Army and a Navy, I should imagine the Executive would perhaps recognize that it was more than an invitation, but was an actual matter of law which he was obliged to carry out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should hope so; but there is nothing I know of anywhere which would require him to do so, unless he wanted to do it.

Mr. LONG. We cannot require the Executive to abide by a law, although he can be impeached. I hope the Senator will agree that it would be desirable, first, to try to legislative proposition to maintain the strength of the Army and the Marine Corps rather than seeking to impeach the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Of course, the Senate cannot originate the impeachment. Even if the Senate were unanimous in believing that the President should be impeached, we could not initiate the action. The body on the other side of the Capitol would have to sit as a grand jury and prepare the indictment of impeachment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to align myself with the statements made by the distinguished Senators from Louisiana relative to the intent of Congress, when that intent is made clearly known through the necessary language in appropriation bills. The impounding of funds by the executive branch is applicable both to Republican and Democratic administrations, because we all remember that before the Korean war, Congress voted for a 70-group Air Force.

Then the President, Mr. Truman, and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson impounded the extra funds above those needed for a 48-group Air Force.

We know that 4 years ago, when the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] offered an amendment, which was agreed to, raising the appropriations for the Marine Corps by \$40 million, that money was impounded by the present administration, and the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, tried to spend that money in other ways, until the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, got wind of it and called Mr. Wilson before the committee. Since the administration did not plan to use the money for the Marine Corps, I think the money reverted to the general Treasury; did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. A part of it did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The latest example is what Congress did last year in stating specifically that the National Guard should be maintained at a strength of, I believe, not to exceed 300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was 400,000 in the National Guard and 300,000 in the Reserves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Army Reserves were to be maintained at 300,000; the Marine Corps at 200,000; and the Army at 900,000.

How is it that the intent of Congress, which I thought was clearly spelled out in those four categories was carried out only in the fields covering the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves, but not in the fields of the Marine Corps and the Army itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case of the National Guard and the Reserves, the appropriation bill itself provided language that the numbers should be not less than those indicated by the Senator from Montana; whereas in the case of the Regular Army and the Marine Corps the money for the larger force was appropriated and the congressional intent was expressed in the committee report. That was the justification given by the Department of Defense for differentiating between the items.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in stating that it is the intention of the Department of Defense this year, again, to request that the strength levels of the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves be cut?

Mr. RUSSELL. The budget for fiscal year 1960 contemplates reducing the strength of the Army Reserves and the National Guard. The reduced strength of the Active Army and the Marine Corps would be continued.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is this one way in which we can circumvent the impounding power of the executive branch of the Government: namely, to write into the appropriation bills, as was done for this fiscal year in the case of the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves, identical provisions for the Marine Corps and the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. We can try, I may say to the Senator from Montana, but it still will not compel the President of the United States to spend the money if he decides he will not spend it. In this instance, the Department of Defense un-

dertook to draw a distinction between the forms of congressional action; but heretofore the numbers both of the Army Reserves and the National Guard, and of the Army and Marine Corps, as well, were determined by the amount of the appropriation for each organization. In this case, the Senate made a determination in the case of all four. We provided in the bill for an Army of 900,000; for 200,000 marines; for 400,00 in the National Guard; and for 3,000 in the Army Reserves.

When the bill went to conference, the other body refused absolutely to accept our proposal so far as the regular establishment was concerned, because they said the intent had always been carried in the committee report.

In order to get a bill, the Senate finally receded from its provision and placed the figure in the report. But we appropriated money for 900,000 in the Regular Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps, just as we did for the 400,000 in the National Guard and the 300,000 in the Army Reserves. But the Department of Defense saw fit to draw a distinction between them.

Of course, this year, if Congress in its wisdom considers this desirable, we can state in the appropriation bill the numbers for the Army, the Marine Corps, the National Guard, and the Reserves. We can say that each of these branches shall be maintained at a certain number or at not less than a certain number, and see then if the Department of Defense will accept the figures when they are set forth in the text of the bill any better than it did when the figures were contained in the committee report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Evidently the administration has its wind up on the matter of reducing forces. They did not put the Marine Corps and the Army cuts into effect at the time of the Lebanon crisis, did they?

Mr. RUSSELL. They had already announced them, but they delayed putting the cuts into effect when the Lebanon crisis arose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They did not do so at the time the crisis arose affecting the islands off the shore of the mainland of China last September and October, did they?

Mr. RUSSELL. They have not done so completely as yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But they are planning to make cuts just before the deadline on Berlin, May 27.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are reducing to the levels they desire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say or indicate that in addition to the cuts in the Marine Corps and the Army, which are now going into effect, and which I think certainly are open to question, further cuts in these two outfits are in the offing?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been no direct statement or request in the budget for any lower numbers. But at the time it was first decided to reduce the size of the Army by 30,000 in fiscal 1959, other studies were conducted looking to a still further reduction in fiscal 1960.

Although Congress appropriated funds for the full 900,000-member Army in fiscal 1959, the Department has not yet

reached the level of 870,000 which it sought for fiscal 1959, and no further reduction below 870,000 has been planned for 1960. So there has been no further reduction for 1960. But what I intended to say was that studies looking to even greater reductions than those being sought at the present time have been conducted. I do not say the decisions have been reached, but studies looking to even greater reductions have been conducted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it is not true that orders have been issued to reduce the Marine Corps to 175,000 men and the Army to 850,000 men by June 30 of this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That means that, roughly, the total reduction will amount to 55,000, because I believe the Marines are now approximately 185,000 in number.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Army is around 900,000 at the present time. So the reduction by means of such orders will not be quite that large, because some reductions have been achieved by chips and whitestones, by not replacing losses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, let us assume that the cut in the case of the Army would amount to 45,000 trained men. We realize that the Government has made a large investment in their training. We are discussing the Draft Act. How many men are drafted over the period of 1 year? Would the number be 110,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Between 100,000 and 120,000. Of course, that number will be reduced to approximately 90,000 in 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. But it seems to me that what we are doing is making it mandatory that by June 30 of this year at least 40,000 well-trained men, in whose training the Government has invested a great deal of money, will leave the Army and the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reductions to that extent will be made. Of course, in any event there would have been a turnover, and some of them would have left the services. But undoubtedly there would then be that many less trained men in the military services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the Government, in this year of "the balanced budget," will suffer a subsequent loss, because the replacements which will have to be made will be made of new men who will have to be trained accordingly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot subscribe completely to that statement, because if the terms of service of 40,000 men have expired, that many men will be separated from the service, if they wish to be. But we would have 40,000 men to take their places, and thus we would incur the cost of training the 40,000 men who would replace the 40,000 who had been separated from the services.

But undoubtedly the total overall strength will be 40,000 men less on July 1, as the Senator from Montana has indicated. In fact, it will be nearer 50,000 men less.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At that time we shall have 14 divisions, I believe. Will all of them be combat ready?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; some of them will be training divisions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How many divisions will the Soviets have?

Mr. RUSSELL. We attribute approximately 175 divisions to the Soviet Union. However, I wish to say that the matter is not as simple as it would appear to be. Different countries have divisions of different sizes. In some countries, a division is 7,000 or 8,000 men; in other countries, a division is 12,000 or 14,000 men. But of course the Soviet Union divisions have overwhelming strength in ground forces, including tanks. Worst of all, our country, which has the greatest industrial establishment on earth, has not modernized its divisions properly. The Soviet ground forces are equipped with better weapons than our forces have today. Our forces have a great amount of obsolescent and obsolete equipment. That is one of the most alarming aspects of this entire situation—namely, the fact that we have not kept up with technological advances, in terms of supplying our men and our military forces with the very latest weapons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union, in the case of submarines?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Soviets have three or four times as many submarines as the United States has. Our estimates attribute more than 400 submarines to the Soviet Union; and the United States has slightly more than 100.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States stand vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in the field of naval power, exclusive of submarines?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the United States has a far stronger navy, exclusive of submarines, than the Soviet Union has. Since the end of World War II, the Soviets have built quite a few fast 10,000-ton cruisers, and they have some other modern ships. But in overall naval strength, there is no question in my mind that our Navy is far superior to the Soviet navy. Of course, the carrier strength of the U.S. Navy gives us a great advantage. So far as we know, the Soviets have no aircraft carriers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union, generally speaking, in the air?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can give the distinguished Senator from Montana my opinion, which is based on the hearings we have from time to time. I believe the Soviet Union has more airplanes than the United States has; but I think the United States has a much superior operating personnel, as compared to that of the Soviet Union; and I believe that our best planes, although very few in number, are better than the best of the Soviet planes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Georgia say that the relationship would constitute a standoff?

Mr. RUSSELL. Leaving out the area of missiles, and talking about the operational planes, I would say the United States is superior to the Soviet Union. I do not believe the Soviet long-range bomber command is anywhere near comparable to our Strategic Air Command.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that there is public information to the effect that at the present time, in the field of missile power, the United States has no ICBM's, and neither does the Soviet Union; that in the field of IRBM's, the United States has 10, and supposedly the Soviet Union has somewhere between 500 and 1,000. Those figures, which come from the public prints, indicate that the United States is in a very delicate position; and certainly that position is made more delicate by the approaching deadline of May 27, June 27, July 27, or next autumn, depending on whatever date Mr. Khrushchev wishes to use.

I am very much disturbed over the fact that our Army is being reduced in size. I am extremely disturbed over the fact that the Marine Corps, the only one of our services which has a floor under its strength, will not have enough men, under this year's budget, despite the expressed intent of Congress, to maintain three combat divisions and three air wings. I am sure the Senator from Georgia recognizes that situation, and also recognizes the consequent danger we are in.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed it here on the floor and wherever else I could make myself heard. Whenever I have been invited to attend councils where the highest Government officials were present, I have expressed my unwillingness to see our Military Establishment weakened in any respect, in view of the situation which obtains today in the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When I came to the floor, the Senator from Georgia stated, so I understood, that objections had been made by means of letters, and probably also by witnesses, to the extension of this law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the opposition voiced to this measure, I take it that the committee intends to develop in our military forces a personnel strength which at least will in some way be able to cope with the threats that are facing us today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly we want to have the means of providing all the military strength which will be authorized by the Congress and approved by the executive branch of the Government. But certainly we could not do that without the enactment of this bill, because, in the first place, on July 1, in the absence of the enactment of this bill, the ceilings on all the armed forces would be just above 2 million men. So there would have to be a reduction of all above the 2 million men on the 1st of July; and 325,000 of those would come out of the Air Force.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If that were done, the number of personnel would be reduced from the present figure of how much to a new figure of how much?

Mr. RUSSELL. The overall number of 2½ million would be reduced to slightly more than 2 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, there would be a reduction of 500,000; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the primary purpose of the committee members, in their consideration of this bill, was to preserve to the maximum degree the security of our country?

Mr. RUSSELL. If it were not necessary to preserve the security of the United States, in my opinion, and, I will say, in the unanimous opinion of the committee, this bill would not be before the Senate today, because no one is enthusiastic about any compulsion in the matter of military service in this land of ours, unless all that we hold dear is threatened.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that normally the wish and the desire of the committee would be to eliminate, insofar as possible, this universal draft law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed, whenever the public safety would permit, we would like to see the compulsory element of it eliminated. There are members of the committee—including myself—who at times have believed in a system of universal military training. But I must say that the changes in weapons systems now have caused me to modify my feelings and views in that regard.

So far as the draft act is concerned, it is designed to enable this country to meet the emergencies of this hour and the threats of the cold war with the Soviet Union, in which we have been engaged over the past 12 or 14 years.

The draft ended at the conclusion of World War II, but in 1948, when the cold war began, we could not get into the armed services the number of men we needed, and we had to revive selective service. The act has been in effect since 1948.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it be fair to interpret the mental attitude of the committee in this way? The committee is saying to the people of Ohio and the people of the Nation that, if it were possible, the committee would have gladly recommended a reduction in the number of persons needed to serve in the military forces; but, in the face of the threat facing us, the recommendations of the committee are an absolute minimum of the needs of the military services of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. The position of the committee is that unless we have the manpower that this authority will provide, the security of the country and the freedom of its citizens will be gravely imperiled. It is the position of the committee that this authority to provide the manpower is necessary in order that the security of the country and the freedom of its people may survive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The questions I am about to ask may be somewhat personal, but I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia how long he has been a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. When I came to the Senate there were two committees relating to the armed services, the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs. I became a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs in January 1933. I have been a member of the Committee on Armed Services and its predecessors for over 26 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based on that experience of 26 years of service on those committees, the Senator from Georgia recommends, does he not, to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the country that, for the security of the country, the draft law which is now in effect should be extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do, unqualifiedly and unhesitatingly. In 1948, when the draft law was not in operation, we could not raise the 2 million men needed. There is no way to get the manpower to meet the present crisis without having the existing machinery of the Selective Service Act in effect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the recommendation of the committee unanimous?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was as to the extension of the authority to induct. One or two members of the committee thought the act should not be continued for more than 2 years, but the committee was unanimous in recommending that the act be continued.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to preface my questions by saying that a reading of the report and the recommendations of the committee leads me to the same conclusion the committee has reached. I think an extension of the draft law is a necessity which cannot be avoided. However, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Last fall, when I was in my own State, I talked personally with thousands of young men, and to several hundred groups. One question constantly recurred. These young men had the attitude that they did not seek to avoid military service. However, they repeatedly came up with the thought that if they were drafted, they would go into the military service for 2 years. Perhaps some young men do not object to being drafted, which is all right, but the group I am talking about would rather enlist than go into the service through the Selective Service program.

They pointed out that if they enlisted, they would have to enlist for a 3-year or a 4-year period.

I notice, on page 4 of the report of the committee, under subsection (2), it reads:

Volunteers under the age 26, in the sequence of their volunteering for induction.

In other words, these young men would volunteer to the draft board, and they would still go through selective service. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the committee given any consideration or has it had any reason or cause to give consideration to the situation of young men who do not seek to avoid service, and yet, by

volunteering their services, are subjected to a 1- or 2-year period of longer training and service than those who are inducted under the Selective Service Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. If they serve more than 2 years, it means they have elected to go into the Navy or the Air Force. They can go into the Army for a 2-year period of service at the present time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps most of the young men to whom I talked wanted to go into the Navy or Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the young men choose to go into the Air Force, they will have to weigh whether they want to serve 4 years in the Air Force rather than 2 years in the Army. Many of them do. There is no trouble in obtaining volunteers in the Air Force. Some young men may prefer to serve 3 years in the Navy rather than 2 years in the Army. There are still others who get 6 months' training and then participate actively in the Reserve, in which they must perform 48 Reserve drills and 2 weeks of active duty for training annually. There are many different ways of performing military service. If the young man choose to go into the Air Force, they have to pay the price of serving 4 years.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the committee discussed this particular question?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have discussed this question for hours. Without attempting to make a disparagement as between the different branches of the service, I point out that there is required a greater degree of skill in the Air Force than is required in some of the other branches of the service. If a man were going into the Air Force, and were required to serve only 2 years, by the time he would be trained, he would than be lost to the service. In the infantry, if a young man is a strong boy, with good reflexes, and can carry a gun and learn how to use it, he can be trained in 4 months, and the Army will still obtain 20 months' service from him, even though he has to serve only 2 years.

More highly developed skills required in certain branches of the Army—in electronics, for example—that are just as demanding as are skills in the Air Force; but these positions should be filled by career personnel.

I must say there has been an increasing tendency—although I understand it, I deplore it—for young men to try to get out of having to march and sweat it out with a rifle on their shoulders. Some young men are willing to serve for a longer time in order to avoid having to do it. However, it must be pointed out that the foot soldier is an extremely important member of the armed services, and we must have him. In the last analysis, the man who has won every war from the time man carried sharp sticks to the day of modern weapons has been the foot soldier.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator's own experience prompted his allegiance to the foot soldier?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was in the Navy.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say for the young men, in whom I have a great deal of faith, that in the Air Force—

Mr. RUSSELL. The Air Force has no problem in obtaining enlistments. It sometimes has more applicants than it can absorb. The Navy has more applicants than it can absorb. That is not where the difficulty is. The Army is the only branch which has to use the draft to fill its needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. The problem arises in filling the needs of the Army. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right. It is the only branch which today has to use the selective service to obtain its needed personnel.

Mr. ALLOTT. The reasons for the longer service with respect to the volunteers are, first, the greater amount of technical training required and, secondly, perhaps, the committee feeling that if a man is to have a right to select his branch of service then he should be willing to spend a longer period in service. Is that stating the matter fairly?

Mr. RUSSELL. That feeling undoubtedly enters into it. It has been completely justified by the facts, as stated.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask one other question on a subject which to me appears to be very shocking. On page 5 of the report, in the paragraph the third from the bottom of the page, it is stated:

The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That is a tremendously high percentage. I think I stated earlier that the services have raised mental qualifications since the end of World War II. A much higher degree of mental competence is required now.

To be perfectly frank about the matter, if we became involved in an all-out war we would have to lower the standards, and more young men would be available. We have heard a great deal of discussion over the past few weeks about the strength of our Armed Forces. The services want the strongest bodies and, above all, the most efficient minds they can get in those bodies, to make up for the disparity in numbers as between the men in service in our country and those in service in the Soviet Union.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then this percentage could not necessarily be interpreted in the same light with the inductions prior to World War II?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLOTT. Or inductions prior to the Korean War, because of the raising of the physical and mental standards.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. This does not reflect any depreciation in the mental and physical qualities of our young manhood, but reflects instead an increase in standards.

Mr. ALLOTT. What this really means is that the services have set a goal of a certain number of men. In order to attain what is desired, the services have turned down approximately 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. The services require certain standards.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement. I was very reluctant to approve those higher qualifications, because in a sense they were a limitation on the equal distribution of services.

Mr. ALLOTT. Of the burden of service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of the burden of military service. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and all the ranking generals in the Army, were most insistent that since there was a reduction in personnel in the Army there was a requirement for the higher standards. The Army has been reduced from about 1½ million to 900,000 men, and in the light of that reduction these military men felt it was imperative that they have persons with higher mental capacity, because they could train those men much easier, and those men could do many more things and absorb training in a much shorter period of time.

In addition, this program has greatly mitigated the disciplinary problems of the Army. I first would not accept the relationship of the disciplinary problems to the somewhat lower intelligence quotients, but since we have authorized the President to raise the mental standards the Army has closed two of its disciplinary barracks. There has been that much reduction in the disciplinary problems of the Army.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is wonderful news. I think this is an area to which we have to pay some attention.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator it has been a matter of great concern to the members of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure it has been. In this respect what we are really doing is not having a selective service in one sense; we are putting the burden of service only upon those who have the highest physical qualifications and the highest mental qualifications.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must confess there is a great measure of justification for the Senator's statement.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will bear witness to the fact that for two sessions I held up the proposed legislation to increase the standards because it looked to me as though it would be unfair to the young men who were more intelligent and stronger.

After all, standards are all a matter of degree. We had standards before. It was all a matter of degree as to how high we should raise the standards.

Our need for a strong military force was so great that I finally capitulated. We passed the bill last year. I must admit the program has produced results far beyond anything I anticipated at the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me and permit an interruption at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, if the Senator from Colorado does not object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the correct thing to say is that the pro-

ram has increased the selectivity and reduced the universality.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We used to talk in terms of universal military service, and now the emphasis is upon selectivity. The changing of the standards has entirely shifted the burden of responsibility.

Mr. RUSSELL. A number of things have contributed to that effect. The weapons of war have become more complex in the last 20 years. I think the complexity has increased in the last 20 years more than in the two centuries before that. Weapons are so complex today that I have almost despaired of being able to observe an ordinary military outfit operate one of the missile batteries. It requires a very high degree of training and a very considerable basic education simply to get the count-down handled exactly as it should be.

That is one reason I have not been too much frightened by the claims of Russian missile superiority. If the Russians have the missiles operational everywhere, they must be sadly depleting the faculties of their educational institutions. It takes almost a team of college professors to operate one of those missile batteries. If the Russians have the missiles operational everywhere, they have had to use many highly competent persons.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the answers the Senator has given. I knew perhaps all of these things had been considered by the committee, but I think it is worthwhile to point out, as the Senator from South Dakota has indicated, that the emphasis has been changed, probably of necessity, from a selective service system of universality to a selective service system of selectivity.

Mr. RUSSELL. The standards have been changed from time to time. They were changed drastically from 1940, when we passed the first bill, to 1942.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. In 1940 the standards were about as high as they are today, but by 1942 if a man could walk, the services carried him off, gave him a gun, and put him in the armed services. We needed 14 million men. This has never been a universal program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has always been a degree of selectivity.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize there has never been a time when the Army or the military forces were in that category completely.

I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. KEATING. Would it be fair to say that in the committee the only substantial dispute regarding the bill was with relation to the length of time the draft should be extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. As a practical matter, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York, no motion was made to

change the 4-year provision. The committee was unanimous in agreement that it was necessary to extend the authority to induct. One or two members of the committee expressed the wish that the law might be extended for 2 years instead of 4 years, but after full discussion there was no formal vote on that suggestion.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it is my intention to support the extension of the draft law. I have been debating in my own mind, although my knowledge is much less extensive than the knowledge of members of the committee, whether the extension should be for 2 or 4 years.

Is it not a fact that if it were extended for 4 years, and the world situation should change, and the need for the draft should become less apparent during that period, the Congress at any time could end it, even if it were extended for 4 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only could the Congress end it, but the executive branch of the Government, if it did not need the men, could declare the draft inoperable at any time. Congress would not have to be in session. There could be a cessation of the draft at any time, if men were not needed in the Armed Forces. As pointed out by Assistant Secretary of Defense Finucane, who is in charge of manpower, it is a great clarification to the young men of the country to know that the draft will be in operation for 4 years. This will prevent them from building up false hopes and making their plans for the future based on the illusion that the draft may end, when we really do not see any hope of its ending.

Mr. KEATING. I think there is much merit in that position.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in connection with the point which the Senator from New York raised, there was a feeling on the part of several members of the committee that the draft was not operating perfectly, that there was some room for improvement, that the reserve liability was unequal, and that the values for dollars expended might be increased with longer terms of enlistment, rather than a period of 2 years.

I would not want the Senator from New York to think that the only question considered was whether the extension should be for 2 years or 4 years. In that connection, let me say that I intend to speak on some of these points, and also to discuss 2 amendments which were discussed within the committee. I shall offer one of them.

One of the amendments had to do with simplifying and clarifying the period and conditions of liability, both as to active duty service and as to the Reserve.

The second amendment had to do with the possible creation of a manpower commission for studying the manpower needs currently and making such recommendations as its studies might lead it to make.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senator from South Dakota share my feeling, which is apparently the feeling of the Senator from Georgia, that it would be wise to extend the draft for 4 years, because of the fact that either the Defense Department or the Congress could act at any time, if it should be found that it was not needed?

Is it not better, at this crucial time, to err, if we err at all, on the side of too long an extension, rather than on the side of an extension which is not long enough?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two or three arguments were made for the 4-year extension. The first was that the last time the draft was extended, it was extended for 4 years.

The second argument was that the 4-year extension would perhaps provide a great show of determination for our allies, even recognizing the fact that one of them, England, has indicated that she intends to discontinue conscript service in a year or two.

The argument which was cited as being most persuasive was that the 4-year extension would give to the young men who would be affected a certain sense of definiteness, and they would have the knowledge that the draft would be extended that much longer. All those arguments were mentioned as reasons for an extension of 4 years rather than 2.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it has been a great privilege for me as a freshman Member of the Senate and as a newcomer to the Armed Services Committee, to work under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in the preparation of the legislation now proposed. I have been impressed by the unanimity of opinion among my colleagues on the committee regarding the necessity for extending the draft. Surely it is apparent that at the present hour there is no alternative to such an extension.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would be remiss in my obligations and in my responsibility as a Member of the Senate to promote the national security, if I did not rise now to voice certain doubts which I feel concerning the draft program.

Chiefly, my doubts are whether our present manpower policies are giving this country true security in the missile age—or the illusion of security only. Therefore, it is my hope that Senators will consider on a continuing basis our manpower policies so that if workable alternatives to the draft exist we will know that they exist, and will put them to work for the safety of America.

If the answer to our manpower need is universal military training, we must find this out and adopt some plan of universal service at once.

If it be a professional Military Establishment, increased in size and equipment, we should know that, too.

Perhaps there is a solution which would utilize in the fullest degree in the service of their country the talents and energies of thousands of young men not fit for, or not needed in, the Military Establishment.

If the answer is found to be the current selective service, that system should be continued. But in that event, it is the duty of Congress to look into the practicability of some of the improvements which suggest themselves.

One reason given by witnesses who appeared before the committee for an extension of the draft for 4 years is that failure to extend it for that period of time would dishearten our allies. I am troubled by the implication, if it be a fact, that our alliance is so tenuous as to require us to maintain a static military manpower policy that may not be best calculated to shore up the security of the United States of America.

That there must an extension now of selective service, should be or ought to be obvious. My personal preference after hearing much of the testimony given by the committee would have been for a 2-year instead of a 4-year extension. It was and is my thought that an extension for this shorter period would point up the necessity for proceeding with an overall study of military manpower utilization and our manpower needs. However, I realize that I am of the newest of the new, having entered the Senate and having gained a place on the Armed Services Committee only in January of this year. I have yielded to the accumulated experience and wisdom of my elders in service on the committee and I voted to report the 4-year extension and I shall vote for it on the floor. Notwithstanding, I believe I have a duty to perform in calling to the attention of the Senate my views relating to an imperative need for an honest-to-goodness, down-to-earth study of this big and vital subject. I cannot believe that the shorter extension would have frightened our allies. Indeed, is it not altogether likely that they will be far more concerned with the announced reductions which are to be made in our existing military organization? That is almost surely to be of grave concern to them as it is to me and to so many other Americans.

There must be on our part no hint of weakness or fear. The Russians must see in us a determined unity with which we face whatever may befall. But, in the face of so grave a military danger, it would be folly and negligent not to examine the manpower situation thoroughly in the light of current facts.

I raise these questions today because they suggest serious problems which, unattended, could undermine our security. Now I am no military strategist, but the overall impact of these questions seems to me to indicate an urgent need for a frank and full study by a congressional panel or an independent commission. I reserve the privilege of submitting at a later date a formal proposal for such a study.

The more I consider the question, the more advisable it seems to me to have the study carried out by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, rather than an independent group not associated with the Senate.

During such an inquiry, no slightest delay for complexity would impede the continuation of the present system. And

if the present system is found to be adequate, or no better alternative has been worked out, there need be no change and no delay in the implementation of the draft.

Let us think of the changes in the military situation which have occurred since the last time the draft was examined by the Congress—changes in warfare perhaps more extensive than those that occurred in all the centuries of human history—sputniks and luniks and intercontinental missiles and missile-bearing submarine fleets; and soon man to be sent into the heavens, too. Can it be sensible to assume that in the midst of so vast a redoing, manpower procurement policies alone must remain static, unimproved, even unquestioned?

Surely it is now clear how directly our international posture is affected by our manpower policies. It is no slight to these policies nor on the men who have carried them out so faithfully. To suggest that these policies, too, need periodic reexamination. Perhaps the study for which I speak today would find that we need a larger Army and that the best way to get it is a larger draft call. This, too, the American people must know and, knowing, would gladly accept.

Indeed, we must know how our Reserve program is standing up under the new strains and needs, how our pentomic divisions are faring—how nearly ready we are, in short, for any type of onslaught. If we are anything less than ready, the degree of difference may be the measure of our demise. If anything is plain, it is that the situation is just that ominous.

In 1941, in the face of a grave military threat from abroad, at a time when the nature of warfare more certainly justified a draft program than does the nature of warfare in the missile age, and when the totalitarian threat was no less immediate, one vote in the House of Representatives saved the draft. That vote may well have been the margin of our survival in the dark days of 1942. Statesmanship in the House of Representatives in 1941 saved America. Statesmanship in the 86th Congress by Members of the U.S. Senate may again save America in the face of the grave military threat from abroad. That statesmanship requires us not merely to enact a draft extension, but also to commit ourselves to a careful reappraisal of our present manpower policies. In the context of new weapons, old answers are not adequate. Complex new weapons demand complex new skills and we ignore these demands at the peril of our existence.

Even if we have adequate missiles in our arsenals and adequate pentomic divisions on the charts, well-trained, highly motivated men remain the lifeblood of the whole structure. Missiles do not fire themselves. Atomic artillery do not maintain themselves. Technology does not advance or explain itself. Is it really inconceivable that the draft—so necessary to meet our manpower needs in 1940—may no longer be adequate to the needs of 1960?

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I now raise for the consideration of my colleagues in the months to come what

I submit may well be life-and-death questions.

First. Is conscription a permanent feature of U.S. defense policy, according to present military plans?

Second. If conscription is likely to continue indefinitely, are major efforts being made now by the Defense Department to improve the Selective Service System to eliminate such inequities and inefficiencies as may currently be a part of it?

Third. If conscription is not to continue indefinitely, what plans are being made now by the Defense Department to lessen our dependency on and eventually to eliminate conscription?

Fourth. Might now such a study of manpower policies have value in ascertaining such facts as our overall manpower requirements; the most effective way to retain trained men in service for longer periods of time; possible nonmilitary uses of men of draft age; the possibility of reducing the number of men constantly involved in training soldiers who do not intend to say in the armed services, and so forth?

Fifth. Can men be trained in (a) 6 months, (b) 2 years to operate the more complex weapons of modern warfare?

Sixth. Is this training of much value to the Nation if men are separated soon after they become proficient in the use of such weapons?

Seventh. How many draftees receive continuing combat training after their initial 8 or 16 weeks?

Eighth. Are we training an adequate number of men to fight limited non-nuclear wars in which mass armies are engaged?

Ninth. If draftees are not trained to operate the complex instruments of modern warfare, can we risk using them in combat situations, even if nuclear weapons are not immediately involved?

Tenth. In a limited war in which nuclear weapons are used, would a mass army untrained in nuclear warfare be adequate to our needs?

Eleventh. In an all-out war decided by a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, would a large army or large reserve force, especially a reserve force derived from the 6-month program, be of great value to the United States?

Twelfth. In short, is the training received by 2-year draftees adequate for any kind of war, be it total, limited non-nuclear, or limited nuclear?

Thirteenth. Is it possible that the manpower needs produced by new weapons cannot be met adequately without a substantial increase in the number of men who stay in the service for a minimum of 4 years?

Fourteenth. Is the training that men are getting in the 6-month program or in the 10-week Air Force training program adequate for any kind of war?

Fifteenth. If the 6-month training program is not adequate to prepare men for combat and other military assignments, should the program be continued?

Sixteenth. If the 6-month training program is adequate, should we not put it on a universal basis, and couple it with

incentives designed to keep the requisite number of men in the Armed Forces for minimum periods of 4 years?

Seventeenth. How effectively are the (a) 6-month, (b) 2-year selectees being integrated into Active Reserve units?

Eighteenth. Might an adequate Reserve program provide an acceptable substitute for a large standing army, a large percentage of whose personnel are not prepared for nuclear combat?

Nineteenth. Is it not possible that the arbitrary limitation imposed on the size of our Armed Forces by budgetary considerations has handicapped international negotiations looking toward disarmament?

Twentieth. Is it not possible that actually a larger standing Army could be maintained at less cost by an improved incentive system?

Twenty-first. In fact, regardless of size, might not the replacement of conscription with a system of incentives designed to attract and keep a competent and motivated professional armed force save money and produce a better nuclear-age defense system?

Twenty-second. But if the size of the Army is to be limited, might it not be wise to speed the replacement of soldiers by civilians in noncombat positions?

Twenty-third. Could not many such noncombatant jobs be filled more economically and more efficiently by civilians?

Twenty-fourth. In the long run, might it not be wise to employ civilians even in certain technical positions, if some way cannot be devised to retain service personnel for considerable periods of time after their training has been completed?

Twenty-fifth. Does not the fact that almost three-quarters of all enlistees leave the service after their first hitch seriously limit the value of conscription in filling the manpower needs of the service?

Twenty-sixth. Might not the \$14,000-per-man cost of training and maintaining draftees, 96 percent of whom leave the Army after their 2 years, and of training the one-hitch enlistees, be adequate to provide the kinds of salaries and benefits necessary to maintain an adequate professional force?

Twenty-seventh. Is part of the problem of attracting and keeping bright technicians in the Armed Forces derived from the fact that personnel are subject to certain conditions left over from an earlier military tradition which do not comport with the type of mental and technical initiative now required of military personnel?

Twenty-eighth. Is a system under which some men serve their country involuntarily up to 8 years while others do not serve at all the fairest that can be devised?

Twenty-ninth. Is a system which continually occupies a large percentage of our military personnel in the basic training of transient recruits the most efficient use of manpower that can be devised?

Thirtieth. Is such a system an adequate alternative to a combat-ready fighting force with a low turnover and a high proficiency in the use of modern weapons?

Thirty-first. Does the confidence of our allies in American leadership require us to maintain a manpower policy that may no longer be adequate to our own security?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to commend my colleague highly for his very thoughtful and comprehensive analysis of this question. It shows how well he has taken advantage of his relatively brief membership on the Committee on Armed Services. What he has presented to the Senate is a wonderful blueprint for study by the committee during the coming years.

Needless to say, like my colleague from Alaska, I feel in duty bound to support the bill which, after extensive hearings, has the recommendation and the stamp of approval of the Committee on Armed Services, headed by a Senator who, more than any other Member of the Senate, is experienced in this extremely important field. I was privileged a few weeks ago to attend a testimonial banquet in honor of Senator RUSSELL. I felt privileged to be there and to join with the large group of military and civilians in approval of the citation and the testimonial which was given to him for his magnificent contribution to national defense.

Certainly at this time there is need for the expert opinion by which the rest of us who are necessarily less familiar with this subject have to be guided; and I may say that we in Alaska have been peculiarly sensitive to the needs of national defense. We have lived through a period when there were no defense plans for that area.

I recall that 24 years ago testifying before a Military Affairs Committee of the House, the late great Billy Mitchell emphasized that the importance of Alaska strategically was something we could not afford to overlook. He said at that time: "He who holds Alaska holds the world." His wisdom on that subject was as much disregarded as was his wisdom concerning the importance of aircraft in war.

I have lived through the years when the sole efforts to get defenses for Alaska were confined to Alaskans. I recall how Senator BARTLETT's predecessor as Delegate from Alaska, in the House, Anthony J. Dimond, strove for years to get some defense measures for Alaska enacted. I recall his prophecies both on the floor of the House and in the committee that the Japanese would attack Alaska without warning. I have in my possession a letter written to him as late as 1937, by Gen. Malin Craig, who was then Chief of Staff of the Army, after Delegate Dimond had urged the establishment of an Air Force and Army post in Alaska, in which General Craig replied, that the idea was fantastic; that Alaska was so remote from any possible theaters of conflict that the idea of spending any money for defense there was ridiculous.

I recall that away back in 1904 the Navy sought to establish a naval base in the outer Aleutian Islands, on the Island of Kiska. Year after year the Navy Department presented a request for an appropriation so that that island could

be fortified. But the navy which first occupied the Island of Kiska was not Uncle Sam's navy, but the navy of the Mikado. In consequence of the lack of understanding of Alaska's strategic importance and the consequent failure to provide for its defense, Alaska was the only part of America invaded and for a time held by the enemy.

I could continue almost indefinitely to give examples of how sensitive and how keenly aware we are of the importance of national defense and of Alaska's role in national defense. We Alaskans believe that an important part of Alaska's destiny is to serve as a bulwark of defense for the continent. I shall vote for this measure though with substantial doubts. I think my colleague is to be greatly commended for raising in categorical form as questions, some of the doubts which some of us have.

I myself would have preferred a 2-year extension. I listened to some of the arguments against that modification. I noted particularly the comment made by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber now. He said that one reason why he did not favor a 2-year extension, but rather favored a 4-year extension, is that there would be no appreciable change in the situation during those 4 years. I assume he meant by that that there would be no appreciable change in our relations with the totalitarian power which now menaces the freedom and peace of the world.

But I call his attention to the fact that there may be one very fundamental change in 1960, namely, a change in the Executive power of the Nation. Therefore, I think the time may come, even though we shall have extended the act for 4 years, when we will want to revise this law together with our other defense measures, as was so ably discussed and criticized in the Senate yesterday, and to take a new look at our needs for national defense and the strengthening of our national security.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish, first, to express to the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] my appreciation for his very complimentary references to me.

I am delighted to have the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I particularly appreciate the fact that he brought an inquiring mind with him to the committee. At times we have dealt with these problems for so long that we have become somewhat set in our views and our opinions. So it is always well to have someone asking new questions and generating new thoughts in the committee.

I have been so much impressed by the capacity of the senior Senator from Alaska to serve on the Committee on Armed Services that I regard it as being of vital importance that he has been assigned to the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness, where he will have a great many opportunities to exercise this

sense of questioning which is in his mind, and to undertake to get answers from the military authorities and the civilian officials of the country who are charged with the responsibility in this area.

I am glad he has asked the questions he has propounded. I think I could answer some of them, but I shall not undertake to do so now. I do not know that I could answer all of them to his satisfaction, but I certainly welcome him on the committee and appreciate the fact that he has fallen right into the work. I know he will make many valuable contributions to our national defense and to eliminating some of the admitted inequities in our present system of service.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I know of no one anywhere who is more capable of answering my questions than is my able chairman. I join with my colleague from Alaska in praising the effective work for his Nation which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has performed throughout the years. I thought only this afternoon that it was rather remarkable that he stood here and answered, without reference to a book, a note, or a piece of paper, the many technical questions which were put to him during the consideration of the bill. It was really a remarkable demonstration, one which few persons anywhere could have accomplished. We owe him much, and we recognize the fact, with pleasure and with pride.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have listened with great pleasure and pride to the very able statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. I was privileged to know him when he served as a Delegate from Alaska in the other body. I am very happy that he sought membership on the Committee on Armed Services, where I have served ever since I entered the Senate.

I think the contribution which the senior Senator from Alaska has already made, in the thorough way in which he covered the subject and the diligent manner in which he attended the committee hearings, is something which will please all Members of the Senate. All of us who are members of the Committee on Armed Services are very fortunate to have the privilege of serving under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not think I have ever known a greater legislator, a man of more ability, or a wiser or better man. So when the senior Senator from Alaska sought membership on the Committee on Armed Services, I thought then that he would have an opportunity to render the type of service which he has demonstrated today he is capable of rendering.

I had a chance to visit his State in the early days of World War II, in 1942, and I was greatly impressed with the loyalty, the patriotism, and the dedication of the people who live in Alaska.

Mr. President, nothing has given me more pleasure than to observe the com-

petence, the teamwork, and the patriotism of the two Senators who work side by side in representing the largest State in the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader. It is a privilege to serve under two such great leaders as the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska. I do not have the benefit of membership on the Committee on Armed Services, and I am not so familiar with this very difficult and delicate issue as he is. However, I share with him the view that the extension of the act should have been for 2 years only. I also have in common with him the opinion that there should be a very detailed, extensive thorough, and painstaking review of our military manpower policies, particularly with respect to the draft.

Mr. President, I believe both suggestions which have been made by Delegate BARTLETT should be considered by the leadership. I should have said "Senator BARTLETT." I have known him affectionately and personally as Delegate BARTLETT for so long that I am afraid I have gotten into the habit of addressing him as "Delegate."

Mr. BARTLETT. I am used to it; I like it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is a very illustrious title.

I think both of the proposals made by the Senator from Alaska should be considered not only by the chairman and other members of the Committee on Armed Services, but also by the leadership of both the Senate and the House.

I think few Members of the Senate are as familiar with the policies of our Armed Services, as a result of long experience, as are the two Senators from Alaska. I had the privilege and the experience of serving in the Army in Alaska and the Yukon during World War II. At that time the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was the Governor of Alaska; and the senior Senator from Alaska Mr. [BARTLETT] was, part of the time, Secretary of the Territory of Alaska, and then he succeeded the very eminent Anthony J. Dimond as the Delegate from Alaska. It was while they were the civilian officials in charge of the Territorial government of Alaska that, if I am not mistaken, Alaska became the only portion of the North American continent under the sovereignty of the United States to be invaded in well over a century of American history.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So, for example, they have had experience with military policies which were not wise—because, if I am not mistaken, at the beginning of World War II, during which Alaska was invaded by the forces of Imperial Japan, the only guns in Alaska pointed toward our good ally, Canada, which fought side by side with us during that

war. Furthermore, if I am not mistaken, at the beginning of World War II the only artillery in Alaska was at Chilkoot Barracks; and the guns were pointed, not toward Imperial Japan, which invaded Alaska, but toward the little border post of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police near Pleasant Camp, British Columbia, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BARTLETT. The accuracy of the Senator's memory cannot be challenged and is greater, I am sure, than the accuracy by the guns he mentions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I suppose the assumption was that in World War II our enemy would be Canada, rather than Japan.

So it is obvious that correct forecasts have not always come from the Pentagon or its predecessor.

I should like to mention one thing about the policies in connection with our military services that has disturbed me: I believe that many times we repeat mistakes which previously have been made in the course of our history. I remember that when I was in high school, the statement was made again and again, by many persons, "In the next war, both capital and men will be drafted; and no one will become a millionaire at the cost of blood, sacrifice, and suffering." If I heard that said once, I heard it said a hundred times. It was repeated on the Fourth of July, in conventions of the American Legion, conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in other conventions, and here in the Congress, and generally throughout the country.

But let us consider the situation which exists today: The Congress is considering an extension of the draft law. I will vote with some reluctance for that measure, as will the two able Senators from Alaska. But 2 weeks ago there appeared in the business section of the New York Times a very interesting article which pointed out that on the New York Stock Exchange many of the leading stocks were those of companies which were making missiles, jet plane fuels, electronic equipment for the Armed Forces, and all the other military items that our boys will have to use, perhaps in mortal combat. These stocks have had record rises.

Today we are spending annually on armaments more than we spent each year during the Korean war. Yet the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of armaments, which was invoked during the Korean war, has been suspended.

Last week I introduced four tax bills. One was to restore the excess-profits tax. If we are going to vote for a 4-year extension of the draft, with all that this implies for the young men of this country, then I think the Senate and the House of Representatives—although of course such legislation must originate in the House of Representatives—certainly should study the imposition of some ceiling on the profits of those who will manufacture the jet planes, the tanks, the nuclear submarines, and the nuclear aircraft carriers in which some of our boys may unfortunately lose their lives or be maimed.

Recently, I noticed that the workhorse airplane of World War II—the B-17

Flying Fortress—was stated as costing \$188,000. The jet planes which have replaced it in the bombing field today cost approximately \$7 million. Just compare \$7 million with \$188,000. The largest submarines we had in World War II cost approximately \$8 million or \$10 million, whereas the nuclear-powered *Nautilus* cost approximately \$65 million. If I am not mistaken—and I speak entirely from memory—the great aircraft carrier *Lexington*, of World War II, cost approximately \$90 million. We have on the drawingboards at this time aircraft carriers which will cost between \$350 million and \$400 million.

The other day I saw a statement by one of our leading military officials—and again I speak from memory—that a jet fighter plane costs the Government more than if it were made entirely from solid silver, at the prevailing market price of silver.

So I say that if we vote for an extension of the draft of the young men of the United States, certainly we should consider placing some ceiling on the profits of the manufacturers and industries who are making the weapons of war.

There has been a great deal of oratory about this matter, but there has been relatively little action in connection with it. I recognize that the distinguished chairman [Mr. RUSSELL] and the other members of the Armed Services Committee cannot do anything directly about it, any more than the rest of us can, because this subject comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

But I call the matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe it involves a moral issue of great proportions. It also involves an economic issue, because today the bulk of the \$77 billion budget, which is so controversial, goes for military weapons and military hardware of one kind or another. Under these circumstances, I believe we should restore the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of the weapons of war. It certainly would help our taxpayers.

I wish to thank my good friend, the Senator from Alaska, for bearing with me and for being so sympathetic and indulgent with his time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement I have prepared on my views on the draft—which I am happy to say are similar to those of the Senator from Alaska—and an editorial entitled "A Look at the Draft," which was published on February 4 in the *Washington Post*, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Critics of the draft have contended that it—

1. Creates a cloud of uncertainty which hangs over the heads of young men 18½ through 26 years of age, prohibiting them, in many cases, from making firm vocational, educational or matrimonial plans.

2. Causes inequities as between young men eligible for selective service. It is pointed out that there are approximately 2,200,000 1A's in the pool now and that

about 1,200,000 youths reach the minimum draft age annually. In 1960, this figure is expected to reach 1,300,000. By 1965, it is predicted that it will be nearly 2 million. Some 660,000 persons enter the services each year; 180,000 are inductees. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* noted recently: "Thus, chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age will not see service. This is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer."

3. Fails to provide the services with the type of personnel they require—persons with an aptitude for special training and who intend to make a career of the military—but instead encourages manpower waste, lowers troop morale, reduces leadership quality, and fosters complacency about the system.

I am not a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and do not have the background of service with that group which would enable me to assess confidently the validity of these claims. However, I have observed that many persons with a professional competence to analyze these questions have attested to the need to explore in depth our present military manpower policies. I believe that such an investigation would be highly beneficial. Although I intend to vote for the extension of the draft, because I believe that it would not be wise to repeal this law at such a crucial time in the affairs of our country unless a substitute is provided, I wish to state that I will support legislation which would establish a detailed and comprehensive study of military personnel procurement policies and alternatives to the draft; and if such a group should find that basic alterations are necessary or desirable, I will then urge their enactment.

[From the *Washington Post*, Feb. 4, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE DRAFT

Before Congress automatically adopts a long-term extension of the military conscription law, it ought to take a careful and critical look at the way in which the draft has been operating. When draft calls take only a small fraction of the total number of eligible young men and the great majority avoid military service, a very serious question of fairness arises. John Graham notes in a study for the Fund for the Republic that "because of either disability or fatherhood, more than 60 percent of all non-prior servicemen" were being deferred in early 1957 and "there is no reason to believe the picture has changed since then, or will change in the future."

Actually, the Army is the only one of the military services using the draft. It calls approximately 8,000 a month, of whom fewer than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period. Some 90,000 young men each year take advantage of the plan for 6 months of active training and 5½ years of Reserve or National Guard service; and of course there are many thousands of others who volunteer for service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. All in all, however, the burdens and obligations are distributed very unequally among the 1.2 million young men who come of military age each year. Some have their education, career, or family plans disrupted while many others make no national sacrifice at all.

The House Armed Services Committee has reported a simple 4-year extension of the draft beyond June 30. There is something to be said for using such means to avoid harangue over new plans for additional deferments and special-interest concessions. But there is a great deal more to be said, in our opinion, for the approach of Representative WOLF, of Iowa. Mr. WOLF's bill would provide for a 2-year draft extension, but a concurrent resolution would require an intensive study by a joint congressional com-

mittee of military manpower procedures and alternative methods of meeting the needs.

This newspaper has long supported both the draft and the concept of national service. It does not share the views of those who feel that the country's youth is being stereotyped or "prussianized"; indeed, it believes that most young men benefit in one way or another from their military service. But it recognizes also that there is now no chance of fulfillment of the universal military training plan which Congress approved 8 years ago. With the changing character of war, UMT probably has been outmoded; moreover, it would be extremely costly.

Now, the Army makes some compelling arguments, in which it is supported by the other services, that a draft law is necessary on the books whether or not it is fully utilized. A recent study shows that the Air Force and Navy benefit notably in the caliber of their volunteer enlistees because of the draft; and the Army obtains higher quality men than might otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, the contention that there will be no more Koreas is highly dubious. It is impossible to predict the exact needs of limited war. If the Reserves and National Guard are worth anything, their requirements cannot be overlooked. The assertion that higher rates of pay for the lower ranks would attract an all-volunteer force rather begs the question of national obligation. Does the United States really want to abandon the concept that each young man owes some service to his countrymen? What would be the effect of higher pay scales in the countries where American forces are stationed abroad? And what would be the result in NATO, which is having trouble maintaining its strength, of an American decision to end the draft?

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an overseas technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his helpful contributions to the debate; and I commend him for his wise observations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota obtained the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to yield to the Senator from Maryland, for as long a time as he may need, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may be recognized immediately following the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I believe we should run the Senate one way or the other. If we are going to have a list of Senators to be recognized, we ought to abide by that list. If we are

not going to have a list, Senators ought to be recognized as they address the Chair. I tried to be recognized for a half hour. I was not recognized. Then I was put on the list. Then the Chair did not use the list. The Senate should be run one way or the other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maryland is recognized and may proceed.

APPEASEMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today we are reminded of one of the most disgraceful acts of appeasement in contemporary history. Some 20 years ago a tall, angular man in a bowler hat, carrying the familiar umbrella, returned to England from Munich proclaiming "peace in our time." Shortly thereafter the world erupted into World War II and the black umbrella became a universal symbol of submission to a power-crazed former corporal in the German Army who sought to Prussianize the earth.

The grave question we must face in this the year 1959 is: "Will history repeat itself?" Prime Minister Macmillan has just returned from conferences in Moscow with Nikita Khrushchev. And, although he was subject to snubs and insults from the Soviet chief of state, it would appear that, through fear, he is now preaching "disengagement" and "flexibility" in the solution of the Berlin problem. He is currently trying to sell this appeasement line to DeGaulle, and when he comes to the United States next week it is clear that he will try to get the President of the United States to buy it.

Now, Mr. President, please do not misunderstand me. I believe Mr. Macmillan is completely sincere in his endeavor to lessen the tensions which prevail between East and West on the subject of Berlin. But I also think it is vitally important that the initiative, so far as any negotiations are concerned, remain with this Nation. I respectfully submit that we must not make the same mistake a Briton by the name of Neville Chamberlain made two decades ago. The Berlin situation, if mishandled, could touch off the most hideous war in the history of civilization. It could, indeed, prove to be the end of civilization as we know it.

To prevent such a holocaust we must stand fast. To retreat on Berlin would be just as disastrous as was the retreat from Munich. Our President has called for no surrender, and it behooves every Senator, every Representative, and every American citizen, to align himself squarely behind him and back his stated position. He has left the door open for peaceful solution of the powder-laden Berlin issue, but he has stoutly refused to be browbeaten into submission to the ruthless Communists. The President's position is the right position. He will negotiate, but he will not surrender. He will not forsake principle in the face of

saber-rattling and veiled threats. He will steadfastly respect the commitments made in good faith by this Nation. To do otherwise would be to sell the entire free world out to international communism.

Mr. Macmillan has arrogated to himself the right to speak, not only for Great Britain, but for these United States, and France, and the West German Republic, and all other countries allied with us to stem the Red tide. I do not believe that a man who has indicated his willingness to make concession after concession at the conference table is representative of either our point of view or the viewpoints of our other friends. The American people have every right to resent being spoken for by a man from another land. American taxpayers, after all, have been carrying that part of the world on their backs for some time.

It is only logical—yes, it is in the best interests of world peace—that Dwight David Eisenhower be recognized as the chief spokesman for the West. When the time comes to sit down and negotiate with the Russians, there will be no room for doubt as to where he stands. There is no such word as "retreat" in his vocabulary, and it is fortunate for the Western World that this is so.

Let us in the Congress, then, give him the unqualified support he richly deserves not only as President, but also as the world's most outstanding military leader. Let us resist with all our might suggestions, from whatever source, that smack of appeasement. Let us not be deceived by the innocuous word "disengagement" and "flexibility," for actually their definition is retreat. Indeed, Senators, retreat can spell disaster.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF COLORADO BLUE CROSS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe that the people throughout this country will be interested in the progress of Colorado's pioneering effort to establish a medical care program for our public assistance beneficiaries. The administration of this excellent plan has already attracted nationwide attention from health and welfare agencies. Our State welfare department utilized the Blue Cross administrative facilities and their participating hospital agreements to implement the plan.

I feel that their record is one which will interest my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the 21st annual report of the executive vice president, Thomas Tierney, be reprinted in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter from Mr. Tierney, so that Senators may more easily study it.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, COLORADO HOSPITAL SERVICE

The year 1958, which marked the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Colorado Blue Cross plan, was a year of significant plan progress and achievement. It is a privilege to report that progress and achievement to the people of the State of Colorado.

Continued public acceptance and approval of the Blue Cross philosophy of prepayment was evidenced by the increase of our membership to embrace a total of 616,715 residents of the State. Continued service to our 84 participating hospitals was apparent in our total payment of \$15,125,263 for hospital services—an increase of almost \$2½ million over the payments made in 1957.

From the standpoint of the staff, the outstanding event of the year was the occupation of our new office building. Despite the expansion of our services, and the additional personnel required in the administration of the State's medical care plan for pensioners and the Federal Government's hospital benefit program for servicemen's dependents, the increased efficiency afforded by the new building made it possible for us to reduce our operating expense ratio to 4.7 percent of income; so that 95.3 percent of every dollar we received was returned to our members in the form of hospital payments or in additions to minimum required reserves for future hospitalization. The building is, in a very true sense, a tribute to the subscribing public, to the voluntary hospital system, and to the members of the medical profession who, through mutual cooperation and effort, have found in Blue Cross and its companion plan, Blue Shield, a reasonable and realistic method of financing the health requirements of the community.

It seems to have become a vogue in recent months to level criticism at the voluntary hospital system of America. While an objective analysis of the various articles which have appeared during the last year indicates that the alleged complaints have little relationship to the basic health care provided in modern hospitals, still the publication of such articles continues. Those of us who are privileged to work closely with the hospitals and with their administrative personnel know the complexities of modern hospital administration. Hospitals today are tremendous health centers to which sick persons go to secure all of the benefits of modern medical science, and from which they emerge restored to sound health and a productive role in the community. The costs are high, but the life-saving and health-restoring services are worth every cent involved. It seems only appropriate that we salute the hospitals whose services our members utilize, for their constant effort to make every facility which modern medical science devises available to all of the people at a price which they can afford. To the hospitals of Colorado we pledge our continued support, and to the people of Colorado we pledge our continued effort to render an ever-expanding service.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS M. TIERNEY.

COLORADO BLUE CROSS,
COLORADO HOSPITAL SERVICE,
Denver, Colo., February 25, 1959.

Senator GORDON L. ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: For the past several years, it has been my pleasure to furnish you each year with a copy of our current annual report. You will find the report of our 1958 operations enclosed. Without question, the most significant development in the field of health care financing, not only locally but nationally, during the past year was the inaugural of Colorado's old-age pension medical care program. It has already attracted nationwide attention, and will undoubtedly be watched with great interest by health and welfare agencies throughout the country. We are very proud of the fact that the State Welfare Department saw fit to utilize our administrative facilities and our participating hospital agreements in the implementation

of the plan and I think the record, to date, amply supports the wisdom of their judgment.

During the year 1958, we paid out the total sum of \$3,804,970.84 to the hospitals of Colorado for the care of 16,652 hospitalized pensioners. The total cost of our administration of this hospital care program was approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total hospital expense involved, and even this minimum expense was virtually erased entirely by our being able to refund to the State welfare department its proportional share of the adjustment amounts derived from our routine semiannual audits of the participating hospitals operating costs. Certainly Colorado has led the Nation in developing at least a partial solution to the ever-growing problem of providing basic health care for the constantly increasing number of old persons.

Over 700,000 persons in our State, including the old-age pensioners and the servicemen's dependents for whom we administer the Government's Medicare plan, now enjoy the benefits of Blue Cross membership. I suppose it is true that few businesses in the State have as many people directly interested in their operations as we do. Let me assure you that we are very vitally aware of the tremendous responsibility that such widespread public acceptance entails. If there is ever any occasion when you might have a question with regard to our organization or its administration, it will be a privilege for me to provide the answers for you.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. TIERNEY,
Executive Director.

AGITATION OF ANTI-U.S. RIOTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Red Student Agitators Seen Fomenting Anti-U.S. Riots," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED STUDENT AGITATORS SEEN FOMENTING ANTI-U.S. RIOTS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—And now it's trouble in Bolivia. Yesterday it was in Cuba, and before that in other Latin-American countries where hostility against the United States was artificially intensified by the Communists.

Unfortunately, maneuvers of the Communists in the cold war are usually pooh-poohed by too many people in this country, despite bold propaganda operations that are obviously planned with care. When the anti-Nixon incidents occurred on the Vice President's tour of South America, it was conceded, of course, that an antagonism such as was manifested against the United States could readily have been brought into the open without the slightest stimulus by the Communists. But this was no reason to ignore the impetus given anti-American sentiment there or anywhere else in the world by the Communists.

It so happens that this week an article reporting an alleged remark by a minor American official was published in a magazine reaching Bolivia from the United States. The idea that a chance comment in a magazine, circulating a relatively small number of copies in that country, could produce a riot against the U.S. Embassy and cause the evacuation of its personnel is too fantastic to believe. Only an organized conspiracy by those malcontents with a desire to focus international attention on relations between

the United States and an important South American country could have brought about the tragic episode.

CITES DEMANDS BY PANAMA

The other day in Congress, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, declared that Communist influence is back of some of the demands being made by the Government of Panama for an extension of its territorial waters which would adversely affect American rights in the Canal Zone. He said:

"Those in charge of the Communist movement in Latin America, and especially in the Caribbean area, have undoubtedly focused their conspiratorial activities on the Panama Canal with the purpose of causing destruction of amicable relations between the United States and Panama, with complete liquidation of United States control over the Canal itself."

Nor is Communist activity confined to any one part of the globe. It is noticeable just now in Africa, where fuel is being added to the flames of nationalism. It is operative also in the Far East. A few days ago a United Press International dispatch dated Manila said:

"The Foreign Office warned yesterday it has received reports pointing to growing infiltration by Communists among the Philippine student population."

"Foreign Secretary Serrano conveyed the warning to Representative Lenardo Perez, chairman of the house committee on anti-Filipino activities, and told him to put his committee on alert."

REDS AMONG STUDENTS

The pattern of student infiltration is worldwide. In Latin America, in particular, many of the anti-American demonstrations have originated in the colleges. To plant young leaders who will use any provocation to work up passionate outbursts is a relatively easy device. It has been revealed in Cuba in the so-called youth movement. While the top officials there vehemently deny that the Communists have anything to do with the Fidel Castro regime, it is an open secret in Havana that the Communists are busy causing mischief wherever they can in the little Republic which is struggling to recover from the ill effects of the Batista dictatorship.

In the Middle East the Communist plotters have been more successful than anywhere else. Everyone who has watched the situation in Egypt is aware that the Communists have played an active part there in anti-Western demonstrations. The Nasser government, which at first welcomed such supporters, now is troubled by them. Iraq is an example of a successful conquest by the Communists of a country which until recently was one of America's staunchest friends.

Despite the denunciations of anything that even remotely resembles an intervention in their own domestic affairs, the Soviets are spending hundreds of millions of dollars fomenting internal trouble inside many of the countries sympathetic with the West.

In the United States, the effects of some of the insidious operations by Communists are more and more noticeable. Having won many a big battle in the courts through the aid of legal technicalities, the Communists have continued to plant their propaganda in important places and among groups which are gullible and naive, thus enlarging the scope of the Soviet propaganda drive.

Sooner or later the American people will come to realize that the Communists are succeeding in their infiltration of many countries and are dangerously impairing the relations between the United States and peoples in different parts of the world who normally would be very friendly to the people of this country. It's a significant type of fighting in what has been misnamed the cold war.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUBSIDIES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Rural Electrification Subsidies," which was published in the March 1959, First National City Bank monthly letter on business and economic conditions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUBSIDIES

The controversy over President Eisenhower's plan to help balance the budget by eliminating the Federal interest rate subsidy to borrowers from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) provides a compelling illustration of how hard it is to withdraw Federal assistance once people have become used to it. The President's proposal, made in his January budget message, was simply that "the present statutory interest rate of 2 percent for loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration be replaced by a rate which will cover the current cost to the Treasury of equivalent-term borrowing and other reasonable costs." The Treasury, which provides the funds which the REA lends, has recently been paying up to 4 percent to sell its securities.

The President's proposal immediately drew fire and in a speech before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, whose members borrow from the REA, he gave assurances that "this recommendation would not raise interest rates * * * on outstanding REA loans" and that it was not intended to be harmful in any way to rural electric cooperatives. Nevertheless, the association adopted resolutions asking Congress to protect the 2 percent rate on REA loans and calling for still more Government aid.

Congressional leaders gave warm support to the association's position. A New York Herald Tribune dispatch reported that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON urged the Members to "fight with beer bottles" if necessary to keep their advantages. Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN said flatly: "If 2 percent interest is a subsidy, then I am for a subsidy for that." Explaining his stand, he added, "why not a little subsidy for the millions who, until a few years ago, were the underprivileged?"

The answer to Speaker RAYBURN's question was given by the President in his speech to the Rural Electric Cooperative Association. He pointed out that Government benefit programs are designed to insure that no group of citizens is unfairly handicapped. Once the handicap is overcome, justification for Federal assistance is no longer there.

THE REA'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The fact is that the Rural Electrification Administration has done its work so well that the underprivileged it was designed to serve are underprivileged no longer. The REA was set up in 1935 in the midst of the great depression to put up money for local cooperatives to finance rural electrification. At the time only 10.9 percent of the 6.8 million farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service.

Today, 24 years later and after the provision of \$3.8 billion, REA electrification loans and a vast expansion of service by private utilities, most of the rural electrification job has been done. More than 95 percent of U.S. farms now have central electric service.

Recently REA has been enlarging on its original purpose of financing the distribution of power to rural consumers. Thus, loans to finance distribution and consumer facilities accounted for no more than 65 percent of the \$242 million REA electric loan total in fiscal '58. Financing generators for cooperatives, once rejected as a last resort by

REA in favor of encouraging the purchase of private power, and construction of transmission lines took \$86 million in fiscal 1958.

With the growing emphasis on generating and transmission facilities has come a tendency of REA borrowers to compete with existing privately owned utilities for industrial and commercial customers. In the past 5 years the commercial and industrial business of all REA cooperatives has doubled. Three out of four new customers are nonfarm.

Meanwhile, under a 1949 congressional authorization, the REA has taken on the additional task of financing rural telephone service and through June 30, 1948 had made available \$478 million for this purpose.

Borrowings of the cooperatives regularly exceed repayments so that their financing has involved a continuing drain on the Treasury. The President would make available, in his fiscal '60 budget proposals, \$268 million to increase loans to the electric cooperatives and \$104 million for new telephone loans, as well as \$9.6 million for REA administrative expenses. But, as stated earlier, he believes that the rate of interest paid should measure up to the Government's own cost of borrowing. Though the administration has recommended tightening up on tax treatment of cooperatives, the rural electric cooperatives do not at present contribute significantly to Federal tax revenues. Financing their needs represents a part of the staggering burden of farm subsidies.

Meanwhile, the rural electric cooperatives have become sizable businesses. As early as 1946, REA Administrator Claude Wickard cited as the most important development of the year the fact that REA borrowers have become well-established, stable, mature business enterprises:

"Locally owned and locally operated cooperative groups—which numbered 918 of the 996 REA borrowers as the year ended—exemplify the ability and determination of America's farm people to solve their own problems. Many of these cooperatives are the largest business enterprises in their communities."

The biggest growth has occurred in the post-war period. Net worth of REA electric borrowers increased sevenfold from 1947 to 1957, from \$63.6 million to \$436.9 million. Although more recent figures have not yet been published, their net worth is undoubtedly higher today. In comparison, the net worth of privately-owned electric utility companies doubled.

It is hard to deny the President's conclusion that we have reached a point where REA is no longer an infant enterprise.

BREAKING FAITH?

A question of integrity was raised by Senator JOHN KENNEDY when he assured the representatives of the Rural Electric Cooperatives that Congress would not go back on our word by raising the 2 percent interest rate on REA loans. It is always desirable to have emphasis on integrity in public as well as private affairs. The fact is that, in the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the intent of Congress was that "all such loans * * * shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years."

The tendency of beneficiaries of Government benefits to perpetuate their favored status is what creates suspicion of new Government programs, however meritorious. They tend to go on and on, and cost more and more, as long as the taxpayer will stand for it. The President has set out the proper approach. "Ideally, in a federally sponsored and financed undertaking, it should be possible for the Government to step progressively aside as they reach the stage of self-sufficiency which enables them to move forward under their own sound management, ownership and financing."

The President's objective in curbing subsidies and balancing the budget is to avoid breaking faith with the American people in the most fundamental sense. As he put it to the Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

"Shall Government live within its means, shall our citizens, in a prosperous time, meet the cost of the service they desire of their Government?"

"Or is it to be our established policy to follow the ruinous route of free republics of the ages past, the route of deficit financing, of inflation, of taxes ever rising, until all initiative and self-reliant enterprise are destroyed?"

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if it will be agreeable to the majority leader to have the committee amendment acted on at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to add a new section, on page 2, beginning in line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, are there any further committee amendments? If not, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only other amendment of the committee to be acted on is the amendment of the title.

The bill is open, to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, copies of my amendment have been placed on every desk. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

"COMMISSION ON MILITARY MANPOWER"

"SEC. — (a) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the 'Commission on Military Manpower' (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Commission') whose function it shall be to carry out the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President within 60 days after the effective date of this Act. Four members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and three from personnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed from civilian life as Chairman.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) (1) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

"(2) Each member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States shall receive no additional compensation for his services as a member of the Commission, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(e) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out its duties.

"(f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of—

"(1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces;

"(2) means and methods of improving utilization and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

"(3) alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

"(g) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matter for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or independent establishment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman of the Commission.

"(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

"(i) Expenditures of the Commission shall be defrayed out of funds appropriated to the Executive Office of the President."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield with that understanding.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, and that the Senator may not lose his right to the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate deals with the lives of some 10 million men who are at present registrants under the Selective Service Act, and, prospectively, in the 4 years ahead, for which the act would be extended, would deal with another 4 million young men.

In addition, it deals with the life of the Nation, which is to be secured by the implementation of the act in our Military Establishment.

That the draft should be extended under the present world circumstances seems beyond practical dispute or debate. The act now on the statute books will expire the first of July 1959. I have heard no particular argument—within the committee, at least—proposing that it not be extended. There was some difference of opinion as to whether the extension should be for 2 years or 4 years, but the major question discussed within the committee, in our executive hearings, had to do with the operation of the draft.

It is my personal feeling that the operation of the draft law could be improved, that a better use could be made of our manpower, and that a fairer administration could be obtained. It is for those reasons that I have offered the amendment which is now pending.

My amendment would create a Presidential commission, to be paid for out of the funds of the President, for a study of our manpower needs and problems and the administration of the Selective Service Act.

The amendment provides as follows:

(f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of—

(1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces;

(2) means and methods of improving utilization and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

(3) alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

The Commission would consist of seven members, to be appointed by the President within 60 days after the effective date of the act. Four members would be appointed from civilian life, and three from personnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty.

Also, there are the usual provisions with regard to the employment of stenographic help and clerical assistants.

It is difficult for me to understand why anyone should hesitate to support this kind of proposal. I do not claim originality for it. The language I have

submitted actually was drafted at the request of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I have changed it only in one particular, I believe, namely, to give the Commission the power to report from time to time to the President, along with the requirement in the original draft that a final report be submitted by a specified date. The senior Senator from Massachusetts knows that I am offering the amendment, and I am doing so with his assent in that respect. Because of the consideration of the 2-year and 4-year angle, I believe, he decided, not to offer the amendment in committee, although he did present it there for discussion.

In consideration of the urgency of the amendment, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to comments which have been made during the consideration of this subject in the other body and during the hearings before our committee.

When the House of Representatives voted the extension of the Draft Act, Mr. John T. Norris, staff reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald, carried this paragraph in his report on the action:

There was some support within the Pentagon before its submission to Congress for changes in the draft law because the manpower pool is steadily mounting, but administration chiefs and congressional leaders decided a simple extension of the law was preferable to opening up the complex law to legislative changes that might prove more troublesome than present defects.

In the face of it, if it was recognized that there were defects in the operation of the present draft law, who should have the responsibility of trying to amend it or improve it? If we are to extend it for 4 years, what is the logic of saying that we will not consider improving it because the changes might prove more troublesome than present defects, unless we make some effort to determine how and in what manner the law might be improved?

I recognize that there has been some argument of urgency in connection with the extension of the act. It is true that the act does not expire until the 1st of July. However, the great powers of the world today are considering their strength in an important crisis. There is value in the logic that at this particular time we should make sure that we have the strength we might need. It is good logic to say that we want to reassure our allies in this present world crisis, that we are standing in a firm position, and that we propose to be in a position to carry out whatever decision may be made.

That logic, however, has led to this situation: A bill for the extension of the draft was considered in the House committee for only a very short time, reported to the House, and there passed after 1 or 2 days' consideration.

In the Senate we have the situation that we held 3 days of hearings last week. Yesterday the bill was presented before the committee in executive session for markup. At the time I under-

stood that it would not be brought to the floor of the Senate before Wednesday. Today we learn by the radio and the press that, because of the Legislative Calendar, it was decided to bring up the bill today.

Obviously, under those conditions, Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity really to review the printed hearings, which became available only today, the day the bill was brought to the floor of the Senate. Reporters, the press, columnists, and the people of the country generally have had no opportunity to learn that the Senate Committee on Armed Services had reported the bill, and react in time to suggest to Members of the Senate whatever opinions they may have before the bill comes before the Senate for final consideration.

It seems to me that all those arguments point to the fact that, if there are defects, if there are imperfections in the present law, or in its administration or operation, we should guarantee that there will be an opportunity for study of the operation of the act, and that recommendations will be brought to the attention of the President and the Congress. That is what the pending amendment proposes.

I find the following in Time magazine for January 26, 1959:

The most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable. Of the Nation's 2,200,000 physically fit men in the 18½-to-26-year-old bracket, only 120,000 get grabbed by the draft each year. Thousands of others volunteer, but the fact is that in the skimpy-quota peacetime era it requires little imagination to think up a reason to be deferred, e. g., as a student, a farmer, a scientist, or a hardship case. Thousands of 17- and 18-year-olds exercise their alternative right of fulfilling military obligations with 6 months of active duty and 7½ years of weekly drill and summer camp in the Reserves or National Guard.

If we stop to think about it, the very fact that a national news magazine can print such a statement as "the most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable," raises the question as to what argument can be presented against trying to remove some of the inequities, in a bill which deals with the lives of more than 10 million young men? In the very critical age period between the ages of 19 and 26, or 18½ and 35, depending upon how one looks at the period of liability, what would be more proper than that we should attempt to remove the inequities?

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in its February 4 issue said:

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an overseas technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps, and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it

ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Again, Mr. President, I ask the question: If an editor of a nationally read newspaper can make such a proposal, surely Congress ought to provide for a conscientious, unemotional examination of a possibly less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance on the draft as it is presently constituted.

The proposal I make would make sure that such an unemotional and objective study would be made of the problem, and the Commission appointed would be directed to present its recommendations and reports to Congress.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has been a Member of Congress, either in the House or in the Senate, for some time. Is it not true that every time we are considering an extension of the draft act we are in a period of crisis?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. It seems that the one produces the other, or the one occasions the other. I do not know which it is. We generally act under the compulsion of a critical situation.

Mr. MORTON. I realize that we must make some improvements. I realize, also, that we have made improvements in the past when the law was extended. As the Senator has so ably stated, certain defects are contained in the present act. I agree with the Senator that Congress should correct those inequities. It seems clear that Congress will not do that at this time; that it will not take the time to take such action now.

Therefore I believe the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is an excellent amendment. If a group will objectively study the problem, I feel sure that a more equitable plan can be devised than the present one.

I agree we must extend the act. However, I believe also that it could be extended in a way so that we would not upset the lives of so many young people and the lives of so many young families. At the present time the draft act is a kind of Damocles sword hanging over the heads of many young men.

The Danes have a universal military training system. However, I understand that Denmark uses a system under which the option is left to the young man as to when he will perform his service. The young man knows he must serve. He is given the freedom of deciding whether he will serve before he goes to college or after he goes to college, before he gets married or after he gets married, before he goes to law school or after he goes to law school. He can plan his life, and the choice rests with him, even though he knows he must serve. There is no sword of Damocles hanging over his head.

I understand that the system works fairly well. I understand that Denmark gets the right number of men in the various age groups into its armed serv-

ices. Of course, I do not know whether it would work effectively in this country. However, it seems to me that we could work out a more equitable way of getting the manpower we need. I admit that we need a draft, and that volunteers will not take care of the situation. I repeat, I believe that we should devise a system which will not upset the lives of so many young men and the family life of so many young people. For that reason I believe the approach the Senator from South Dakota is taking is a good one.

It is clear that we should set up a commission to study the problem and that then Congress should set up a system of drafting manpower which will not completely disrupt the lives of so many of our people. I commend the Senator, and I intend to support him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator has put his finger on what we seek to do. It is to provide a way in which someone can unemotionally and in good time study the problem and come up with a better way of taking care of the situation.

With regard to the observation he has made about the inequity of the service, I should like to call his attention to the fact that at the end of fiscal year 1958, June 30, 1958, there were 9 million registrants under 26 years of age.

Of that 9 million, about $4\frac{1}{4}$ million were in service or in the Active Reserve service or had obligated service. The remaining 4,750,000 were still without training. Many of the $4\frac{3}{4}$ million who were without training, or 2.93 million, were non-fathers. Therefore only 3 million of the 9 million registrants under 26 years of age, as of June 30, 1958, were non-fathers and were not sharing the burden of responsibility of universal service.

It seems to me that the point the Senator has made about the system used by the Danes is a good one. Under it everyone makes the same contribution, and the individual can fit the responsibility into his own plans for life. It is certainly something that should be considered by the Commission, if one is set up.

That the authorities who testified before the committee recognized the inequities is evidenced by the fact that the chairman of the committee the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in his questioning of General Harrison, made this statement:

So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation.

I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia nodding his head. I am sure he believes that inequities should be eliminated to the extent it is humanly possible to do so.

The Senate and the country have heard about the Cordiner report. Mr. Ralph Cordiner, who headed that com-

mittee of study for 18 months, dealt with pay and matters of that sort related to the armed services, and he made the statement that we devoted 25 percent of all military effort to training men who do not stay in the service. He was concerned with the waste under the present system.

At another point he said that he had found antagonism and bitterness over the draft and that men were checking off the days until they got out of the service.

Another aspect of the problem was suggested by Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission. In his statement he told the committee that his organization was a private organization founded in 1953 by the major scientific groups of the Nation. The work of the Scientific Manpower Commission had been recognized many times for the great contribution it had made in the study of the need for agricultural scientists, astronomers, biologists, chemists, earth scientists, mathematicians, physicists, and psychologists practicing in the clinical and experimental fields.

Dr. Meyerhoff testified before our committee last week. He said that the power granted to the Selective Service System to induct the young men must be extended. He also stated:

We further believe a 4-year extension is to be preferred over a 2-year extension. We do urge, however, that H.R. 2260 be amended so as to broaden the powers of the Selective Service System and to enable it, by statutory provision, to select men with critically needed skills for assignment to civilian activities that are essential to the national welfare and security.

Then he continued in some detail by supporting his recommendation that the system be given authority for the assignment of personnel to essential selective activities.

At the time the committee was considering the bill, I attempted to design a program which would equalize the service somewhat and would clarify the responsibility of the young men who register. I wrapped that up in an amendment, on which we did not have an opportunity to get opinions from the Department of Defense in any detail. However, it was suggested that the amendment be referred to the Secretary of Defense for comment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment, which I had tentatively drafted, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person may be inducted into an armed force (other than as a physician, dentist, or allied specialist), or enlisted into an armed force, after the date of enactment of this act and before July 1, 1963, only under one of the following programs which the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to provide:

(1) A critically skilled person may be enlisted for 10 years, the first 3 months of which shall be served on active duty for training and the remaining 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ years shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(2) A person may be enlisted for 7 years, the first 6 months of which shall be served on active duty for training and the remaining 6½ years shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve.

(3) A person may be inducted for 5 years, the first 2 years of which shall be served on active duty, the next 2 years shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve, and the last year shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(4) A person may be enlisted for 5 years, the first 3 years of which shall be served on active duty, the next 1 year shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve, and the last year shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(5) A person may be enlisted for four or more years of active duty, and if he so serves for four or more years, he has no additional obligation to serve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment sought to establish a fair relationship between the active duty time and the Ready Reserve liability and the Standby Reserve liability for the registrants under the act. At present, I think the chairman said, there are 30 different ways in which a young man might discharge his responsibility under the present act. Those ways are confusing and overlapping.

The period of liability varies, depending on whether one takes 6 months of active duty training before he is 18½ years of age, or takes it after he is 18½. The liability varies from service to service. It may be that there should be some distinction among the different services. But it has seemed to me that it would improve the situation if there were certainty, definiteness, and a clear statement of the responsibility, so that a young man might choose with his eyes open, so to speak.

The particular proposal embodied in the amendment which I am not now offering, but which I have had printed in the RECORD, so that it might be studied, would create a class A, in which one might enlist for 3 months of active duty and then go into the Standby Reserve for the balance of the 10-year period, during which he would be available for assignment in a number of employments in the scientific or technological field.

Class B would be the group which would take 6 months of active duty and then go into the Ready Reserve for 6½ years. This is comparable to the program which the National Guard now has, but makes the period 7 years total rather than 8.

Class C would embrace a 2-year enlistment or a 2-year induction with a Ready Reserve liability of 2 years following the 2 years of active duty, and 1 year of standby, but would give assurance that at the end of 5 years, under those circumstances, the liability would have been discharged or liquidated.

Class D would provide for a 3-year enlistment with 1 year of Ready Reserve liability and 1 year of standby following that. That would reduce the Ready Reserve liability by 1 year, but it would get for the Government 1 additional year of active duty.

It should be pointed out that this is important because the first 5 or 6 months of service goes into training. Under a 2-year enlistment or 2 years of active duty, a man gets only 18 months

of actual active duty. With a 3-year enlistment, he gets 29 or 30 months of actual active duty. The Defense Department estimated that a 3-year enlistee costs a total of \$17,474. Estimating 29 months of effective service, his average cost for an effective month is \$603. Whereas a 2-year inductee provides only 17 months of effective service, his average cost for an effective month being \$706. In other words, the 2-year inductee costs more than \$100 a month more for his actual service than does the 3-year enlistee. That means it costs something more than \$3,000 more to obtain the same period of effective service.

The amendment on that point would also provide that if one served 4 years of

active duty, he would have no reserve liability either in the Standby or the Ready Reserve.

I hope that Senators who are interested in the total problem will note the amendment as it appears in the RECORD and will compare it with the present service.

For that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which was prepared by a staff member of the committee, I believe, and dated February 6, 1959, showing methods of fulfilling the military obligation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Methods of fulfilling the military obligation

Major programs now in use	Age	Minimum active duty	Ready Reserve participation ¹	Total military service ²
Selective service (voluntary or involuntary induction).	18½ to 25 years.....	2 years.....	2 years.....	6 years.
Enlistment in active forces:	26 to 35 years.....	do.....	None.....	2 years.
Army.....	17 to 34 years.....	3 years.....	1 year.....	6 years.
Navy.....	17 to 31 years.....	4 years.....	do.....	Do.
Air Force.....	17 to 34 years.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
Marine Corps.....	17 to 28 years.....	3 years.....	2 years.....	Do.
Coast Guard.....	17 to 5 years.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
6 months' active-duty-for-training program:				
Army National Guard and Army Reserve.	17 to 18½ years.....	6 months.....	3 years.....	8 years.
	18½ to 25 years.....	do.....	5½ years.....	6 years.
	26 to 35 years.....	do.....	2½ years.....	3 years.
Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve.	17 to 18½ years.....	do.....	7½ years.....	8 years.
Marine Corps.....	18½ to 25 years.....	do.....	5½ years.....	6 years.
	17 to 18½ years.....	do.....	4½ years.....	8 years.
	18½ to 25 years.....	do.....	5½ years.....	6 years.
Coast Guard.....	17 to 18½ years.....	do.....	7½ years.....	8 years.
	18½ to 21 years.....	do.....	5½ years.....	6 years.
Other Ready Reserve enlistment programs:				
Air National Guard.....	17 to 18½ years.....	11 weeks.....	Until age 28.....	Until age 28.
	18½ to 25 years.....	do.....	5 years, 41 weeks.....	6 years.
	26 to 35 years.....	do.....	2 years, 41 weeks.....	3 years.
Army Reserve.....	17 to 25 years.....	2 years.....	2 years.....	6 years.
Naval Reserve.....	17 to 31 years.....	do.....	3 years.....	Do.
Marine Corps Reserve.....	17 to 25 years.....	do.....	do.....	Do.

¹ Participation in Ready Reserve training is mandatory for members of the Army's Reserve components at the present time. The other services encourage voluntary participation on the part of members who have served 2 or more years on active duty. Members who do not participate may be retained in the Ready Reserve for the full military obligation if needed.

² Those personnel 26 years of age or older at time of enlistment do not incur a military service obligation under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, but do obligate themselves to serve for the period of time set forth in the enlistment contract.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, just at a glance, anyone can see how much more complex and confusing, and possibly discriminatory, the present plan is as compared with the more simplified plan.

I ask unanimous consent, also, that a statement which I have prepared on the operation of the Reserve Forces Act under administrative decisions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Because of some administrative decisions since enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, I believe it is possible that an inequitable situation has developed in connection with the length of active reserve participation required by persons in various categories of service. Certainly, there is a degree of indefiniteness about the reserve participation and I suspect that it might be desirable to legislate more particularly into the Reserve program.

One of the objectives of the committee has been the creation of a trained Reserve composed largely of persons who have not fought in a war or served long periods on active duty. This objective was accentuated by the inequities of recalling veterans for

duty after Korea because there simply were no other trained people to call.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which initiated the 6-month training program, offered the opportunity to create a Reserve of this type. When the committee approved that act, it was our understanding that the inductees who served 2 years on active duty would participate actively in the Reserve for 3 years and then have 1 additional year of vulnerability in the Standby Reserve, for a total obligation of 6 years. The persons who voluntarily entered the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ were to participate actively in the Reserve for 7½ years. This longer Reserve participation period was in exchange for their shorter period of active duty for training.

A Selective Service ruling that any person participating satisfactorily in a Reserve unit would not be inducted, had the effect of opening the 6-month training program to persons over the age of 18½. To make a distinction between persons who entered the 6-month training program before they were draft liable, the Department of Defense adjusted the period of active participation required. Inductees had their period of active duty participation reduced to 2 years. Persons who entered the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ had their period of active Reserve participation reduced to 3 years. Persons who entered the 6-month training program after reach-

ing the age of 18½ were required to participate actively in the Reserve for 5½ years.

After the 6-month training program was opened to persons over the age of 18½, the number of young men deciding to enter this program was substantial. The Department of Defense did not accept enlistments in the 6-month training program up to the full potential of the program. The fact that the 6-month training program has not been utilized to the maximum raises some questions about the fairness of requiring active Reserve participation by the relatively few persons who are inducted into the Armed Forces.

This situation, coupled with the administrative adjustments of the period of Reserve participation, has introduced an element of uncertainty into the Reserve problem.

For this reason, I have prepared a draft bill that I had thought I might offer as an amendment to this bill. Because the several provisions of law bearing on this problem are somewhat complex and interrelated, I have decided to seek the views of the Department on my proposal before pressing for its adoption.

I am aware that the authority for the 6-month training program for persons under the age of 18½ will expire this year and that a bill to extend it is liable to be considered. Before the committee acts on this bill, I hope that we may have an opportunity to consider carefully the equities of the several Reserve and active service programs, and that we may be able to introduce a greater degree of certainty to them so that the young men who must make the choice can do so on a more informed basis.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I could have read the statement, but in the interest of saving the time of the Senate this afternoon I have placed it in the RECORD. I may say, frankly, that it is impressive because of the confused state of mind in which it leaves one after he has read it. As a result of administrative decisions, the operation of the present law is very uneven.

During the past year, I point out, when the change was made in qualifications, some 79,000 men were discharged from active duty because of the raising of the mental requirements. It is true that one or two disciplinary barracks have been closed because of the higher quality, mentally, of the men who are now being taken into the service. But it must be obvious that that represents a shifting of the burden of liability for service. Not all of the 79,000 men who were dropped would have gone into disciplinary barracks; in fact, they were not in disciplinary barracks when they were released. They were doing the chores to which they were assigned. But when we get to the point that half the men who are registrants can look forward to not being called, it must be obvious that many men who are qualified do not share the burden equally with those who actually are called.

A Defense Department official—I think it was Mr. Finucane—testified that by the time they reach the age of 26, 9 out of 10 of those considered fit will have served in some capacity, but that situation will change in the next year by reason of the greater number of men who are coming on. It will be about 8 out of 10 of those who are regarded as fit under the new standards. Under the present rejection standards more than half the men have no prospect of

being called. They will be eliminated by the increased standards.

It seems to me there are at least six ways in which the present law is defective. First, it is inequitable in its call. Second, it is inequitable in the reserve liability. Third, there is a failure to insure the meeting of the needs for scientific and technological talent. Fourth, there is a failure to get the most active duty service for the dollars spent, which could be had if there were longer periods of voluntary enlistment. Fifth, there is a waste in manpower by the use of men for jobs for which they are not employing their best talents. Sixth, there is an economic and social loss in the life of the individual himself.

I certainly agree with the statement of the chairman of the committee earlier this afternoon that it becomes an easy excuse to say that there is some moral delinquency or delinquency of youth which is perhaps charged to the operation of the draft law, but which ought not to be so charged. At the same time, I think that in some individual lives there may be created a recklessness in attitude because of the feeling: "Oh, well; I am going to be drafted shortly anyway." I think there may be a delay in making plans. There may be a delay in accepting jobs. Certainly there are young men today who cannot get jobs because when they go to a prospective employer, he asks them, "Where do you stand under the draft?" If a man is unable to give a firm answer the employer—particularly the employer of a small number of persons—cannot afford to take the liability of restoring a man to his job after he returns from the service, if he is to be taken away at just about the time he has learned his job. That is certainly an economic loss.

There is an effect upon the young man himself. While I would not charge, nor do I believe, that juvenile delinquency is primarily attributable to the draft law, I think that in the lives of some young men the attitude of recklessness or the devil-may-care attitude is created, which results in a lower moral standard or a lesser determination to accomplish something than would be the case if he felt he could plan his own life.

It is because there are at least those six areas in which there is an inequity or a loss to the Nation or a loss to the individual or a loss to society that I feel someone should be studying the manpower problem, taking a look at it prior to the time when the time arrives for renewal of the law on the floor of Congress. A commission should be created, as suggested in the pending amendment, which would report from time to time to the President, and ultimately present to the President its specific recommendations for improvement.

Let us not delude ourselves into believing that the country is unaware of the need for improvement of the Draft Act. There is a sort of hopelessness, a sort of feeling, "Well, there is nothing that I, individually, can do about it." I

know that is expressed in some of the letters I receive. But other Members of the Senate must receive, as I do, letters which implore us to do something about this matter, letters which indicate that the people feel that we have a responsibility in connection with it.

Recognition that the act is not perfect at the present time was given even in the testimony of Lieutenant General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service. In the course of his prepared statement he said:

I feel uneasy over our manpower situation.

Mr. President, these statements by General Hershey were made in the course of the formal, prepared statement he presented to our committee. They were not made in response to questions. Instead, they were made in the course of his formal statement to the committee.

He also said:

Millions of our young men have been told they have little, if anything, to contribute to their Nation's defense—because of physical or mental conditions. Others, fewer in number, while deferred in the national interest, are not fitting themselves to meet the day when their lives and the Nation's survival may be at stake.

We are not doing all we should do in preparation against possible nuclear attack. Our training for civil defense lags. Our reserves must be made ready. Our need to do things in preparation is great. Many of them we are not doing.

Much needs to be done, but many are doing nothing. We cannot afford to waste our manpower. There are services vital to survival which do not require a man to wear a uniform. It will add immensely to our chances for survival if we find a way to induce our citizens to give those services, especially those who for various reasons cannot now make their contribution within the military forces.

Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could make a statement which I would endorse more than that one by General Hershey, nor could I offer a statement which would be better evidence of the need for a manpower study commission.

It seems to me that such a study by the proposed manpower commission is the least we can provide for. If we do not have the time that is needed—if we must consider a bill at hearings, one week, and must mark up the bill the next week, and the next day must bring up the bill on the floor of the Senate, before Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee can familiarize themselves with the testimony taken at the hearings—then the least we can do is establish a study commission on manpower, which will be charged with the responsibility of studying the operations of the act and the provisions of existing laws, and then coming forward with recommendations for the improvement of our handling of the most precious resource we have—namely, the young men of our country, upon whom we depend in time of crisis.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill to extend the draft, without any weakening amendments.

I believe that today our military posture is so weak, and the determination of the administration to put money savings ahead of adequate defense is so strong, that at this time the Congress must demonstrate very definitely how it feels in regard to the manpower problem. With each succeeding day the clock ticks off the minutes and brings nearer the end of the "count down" on meeting the Berlin crisis.

It is gratifying to be able to present a united front in our refusal to abandon West Berlin. I am sure that our Allies are heartened by the unanimous voice of the leaders of Congress over our determination not to sacrifice this island of freedom to the Communists of East Berlin or of Moscow.

This month is the 20th anniversary of Hitler's repudiation of the agreement reached with Chamberlain at Munich. Hitler violated it and abrogated it in March 1939. No one in this country wants another Munich.

While we must be willing to negotiate at the foreign ministers level, or even at the summit, experience dictates that in dealing with the Communists, as in dealing with Hitler, the effectiveness of such talks depends, not on the strength of our arguments, but on the strength of our armaments.

It is far, far later than we think in preparing for this crisis. Precious weeks have been wasted, and millions of words have been spoken about our good intentions and our right to stay in Berlin under our treaties with the Russians. But intentions or treaty rights are not enough.

On Sunday, I listened with great interest to the "Meet the Press" program in which Defense Secretary McElroy was interviewed by an able panel of newspapermen. If the opinions voiced by the distinguished Secretary represent the thinking of this administration—the President, the Chiefs of Staff, and the civilian heads of the Department of Defense—then we are pursuing a policy of complacency that will weaken dangerously our hand in any negotiations, whether at the summit or elsewhere.

I was particularly surprised and disappointed to hear Secretary McElroy minimize the importance of having an adequate airlift instantly available, should an emergency result as Russia turns over to the East German Communist government control of access to West Berlin.

If I correctly understood the plain import of his statement, then our present policy is to rely primarily upon the capabilities of the Strategic Air Command to deliver a hydrogen bomb as our answer to any resistance we might meet on the road to Berlin.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri, who long has advocated an

adequate airlift, and for months has been the champion of that effort.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague from Oklahoma. As is known by all Members of the Senate, he is the authority in this body on civil aviation.

I am very much interested in his reference to the program of last Sunday, in which the Secretary of Defense participated. My impression was that, in effect, the Secretary enunciated a reversal, and a return to the theory of massive retaliation, which was originated in January 1954, and later, to the best of my knowledge, was abandoned. Am I correct in my impression? Did the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma receive a similar impression?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; I was frightened and surprised to hear the Secretary of Defense imply that an end has come to our previous policy of trying, of attempting to confine any conflict to a limited war, and to use only conventional forces, if necessary, so as to make sure that world war III would not be triggered off. I believe such a change in policy to be very dangerous, indeed; and I thank my colleague, who apparently received the same impression that I did from the Secretary's interview. The clear implication was that the Secretary of Defense virtually rules out the concept of a limited conflict and the possible use of conventional forces, should the access road to Berlin be closed. Certainly that is the strong impression that I received.

As Mr. Reston, of the New York Times, so ably pointed out, that represents a reversal of our time-honored policy of trying to keep all conflicts in the limited war category and to use conventional forces, rather than all-out hydrogen warfare, with its catastrophic results. The only sane policy for the United States to follow is to prevent, rather than trigger, such a conflict.

I am alarmed by the growing evidence of the administration's neglect of our conventional ground forces, discussed so ably yesterday by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I submit that not only do we lack adequate forces to meet local emergencies, but we are not developing the airlift capability required to insure that we can rapidly and efficiently apply conventional forces at points of danger.

That is why the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], formerly the Secretary of the Air Force, not only has spoken eloquently, but also succeeded in having \$140 million added to the appropriations made last year—as a result of his recognition of this very grave deficiency in our airlift capabilities.

A flagrant example of the failure to appreciate the importance of our military airlift potential is the postponement of the tactical airlift exercises—which were to be conducted jointly by the Military Air Transport Service and the Army, this month—due to lack of operational and maintenance funds in the MATS budget.

Now I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, thanks to the very able chairman of the Armed Service Committee [Mr. RUSSELL], who happens to be present on the floor, and the able chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the majority leader, we did put in the last appropriation bill an item of \$140 million for airlift. That was done after extensive hearings, which my friend from Georgia will remember.

This administration, despite the possibility that something might happen, as has happened now with regard to Berlin, not only did not spend one cent of that money, but, at least up until a few days ago, had no plans for spending it. I am sure that is what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has reference to.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have. I think it is a shame that we have not developed a more adequate airlift with which to deliver forces at points of emergency. That aspect of defense has been completely disregarded, despite the determination of the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Service Committee and the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Now, in view of the neglect to spend the \$140 million to make plans to buy the airplanes we need, the cancellation of the exercise to test the airlift capability which was scheduled for March seems to me to be reaching a new low in defense planning.

This exercise was to test the combat capabilities of the Military Air Transport Service to reach a simulated area of combat with men and supplies at the earliest possible moment. The exercise also was to include the calling up without notice of the planes and crews of regularly scheduled airlines and other nonscheduled carriers to supplement the MATS airlift on a reserve basis.

I do not believe that MATS ever has had a chance to engage in such pre-training for its combat mission. I further doubt that MATS will be able to handle efficiently, on a D-day basis, the vast number of movements required without the practice provided by such tactical exercises.

The Air Reserve fleet, composed of dozens of planes listed by airlines, and their crews, has never undergone such exercises to determine whether they could be assembled and placed on the job under simulated mobilization conditions.

This exercise is as essential to training the MATS organization as it is for the Marine Corps to train in amphibious landings, or for the infantry to engage in war games.

The current cancellation also bears out my feeling that the genuine mission of MATS, and its combat capabilities, has been subordinated to the job of running the world's largest airline to the neglect of its combat readiness. Actual training, under simulated emergency conditions, is necessary if MATS is to be ready for the herculean task that would be thrust upon it if a limited war should break out in some distant part of the world.

When I asked questions as to what it would cost, I was told it would run as high as \$1 million. I pointed out that

the planes are available, as are the crews and the pilots, in the MATS fleet. I pointed out everything is available except the scheduling of the exercises. I was told MATS could not afford it because it would require MATS airplanes to be in the air 8 hours a day, and they could not afford the cost out of the gasoline, maintenance, and operating funds which MATS has.

I expect we shall go along and be satisfied with an airlift that has never been tried under simulated combat conditions or that has never been tried so far as supplying necessary equipment to support our troops as would be necessary if they had to be deployed in a trouble spot somewhere in the world.

It is my earnest hope that we can maintain conventional forces, and the airlift to deliver them, to provide an alternative both to doing nothing and to a hydrogen war. That is our choice today—to have nothing or to have a hydrogen bomb war—and I do not think America wants to make that choice.

America's airlift potential might be the determining force in peaceful settlement of the Berlin dispute. Yet we weaken our hand in the cold war for lack of the extra \$1 million which would have been required for extra gasoline, maintenance, and other operating costs.

The dominating position occupied by Khrushchev does not arise from the strength of any moral position, nor from any treaty rights. It arises from Russia's apparent superiority both in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles and of intermediate range ballistic missiles, and from their superiority in conventional ground forces in readiness.

For budgetary reasons we have taken a second place in the first category of weapons, and for manpower and budgetary reasons, a second place in conventional forces. Thus, we might be forced to a conference with the Communists at the real summit and the United States and free world in the valley.

We must not reduce our bargaining power further by continuing dangerous cuts in our military strength. By these economy moves, we run the risk of costs of millions of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars should our weakness lead to the outbreak of world war III.

The memory is too keen today of Munich and its disastrous results in accelerating, rather than preventing World War II, for us to follow the Chamberlain route and put a balanced budget ahead of balanced defense forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a great contribution in this important field. The Secretary of Defense, as I understood him, said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff felt that the airlift we now have is adequate. I look forward to questioning members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on that subject, as I do not believe that conclusion is accurate. Certainly, all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not think the airlift we now have available is adequate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is not possible that one of the reasons why the Secretary of Defense was forced to fall back to the theory of massive retaliation, as he did in last Sunday's telecast, was that he knows that our Army is neither mobile nor modernized. By "mobile" I mean capable of being moved by air, with their combat equipment and their support. In effect, the Secretary is now admitting that the only thing we are probably in a position to do, if the Russians push their aggression with regard to Berlin, would be to have a nuclear war. Is that what the Senator understood?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly what I understood. The Secretary could not—and I was ashamed for him—tell Mr. Reston the number of divisions which would be available to NATO. If the Secretary of Defense does not know the number of divisions available to the free world, somebody ought to be doing night work and studying his lessons. If the Secretary of Defense does not know the small number of planes we have available for an airlift, somebody ought to be studying his lessons at night. If the Secretary does not know that the MATS organization has never been trained to move troops and equipment under emergency conditions, somebody ought to be studying at night and doing his lessons. America is in a distressing posture. We would go into a meeting in an even lower posture, whether it be a meeting of the foreign ministers or a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev, if we went to that meeting and had to look at two guns pointed at us, one being a deficiency in the missile field—which the Senator from Missouri has pointed out again and again—and the other gun being Russia's superiority in ground troops, with the capacity to have them in readiness.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, made a talk in which he said that in all probability the next war would not be a nuclear war. The President of the United States went out of his way later on to single out that talk for praise. At least by implication, it would appear that he was agreeing with the statement of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, that the next war in all probability would not be nuclear war.

Last Sunday the Secretary of Defense implied that if there were a war in all probability it would be a nuclear war.

I should like to ask my friend from Oklahoma, who has had more experience in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States than most, does he think the American people have a right, as they approach these problems from the standpoint of "We will not give an inch" to at least be clear as to whether this administration believes we should have a nuclear war in case we have to live up to our commitments or believes we should not have a

nuclear war in case we have to live up to our commitments?

Does the Senator agree that we should not have conflicting statements particularly on such vital matters emanating from high civilian and military authorities of the Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. It seems to me instead of confusing our opponents, the Communists, we are confusing ourselves. It depends upon which paper we read whether we are going to be ready and prepared for the beginning of world war III—for the beginning of the awful and catastrophic type of world war III we have historically sought to prevent and, in the event of hostilities, have sought to limit.

I think the only implication we can take from the statement of the Secretary of Defense is that we are putting our loaded six-shooter on the table, when there is an argument about whether deuces were wild or were not wild on the last hand.

I certainly feel that this is no time to be creating an aura of uncertainty. The President in his press conference opposed the cries on the floor of the Senate for even a slight mobilization of our Reserves and for a discontinuance of the reduction of the Marine Corps, about which the able Senator from Missouri has spoken, as being saber rattling. I would rather rattle Marine Corps sabers than do atomic muscle flexing such as was done on the program by the distinguished Secretary of Defense. Which is the more dangerous? Is it more dangerous to call up a few Marines Reserves and to stop decimating those we have, or to have the Secretary of Defense so clearly imply—as I thought he did, and as I believe everyone who heard him to whom I have talked felt he did—that our reliance is on nuclear weapons if it becomes necessary to keep open the road to Berlin.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and congratulate him for the clarity and soundness of the position he has taken this afternoon. Not too long ago one of the finest generals of the Army stated that we did not have half enough airlift capacity to handle a single local or limited defense action abroad. The general has now been retired from the Army. It is obvious that if we do not have half enough capacity to handle one problem in one place it would be relatively difficult to handle two or three problems in two or three places. Such a situation may well be what we shall soon face.

Mr. MONRONEY. And which the Secretary of Defense only Sunday said was a possibility we might face.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

I hope the able Senator from Oklahoma, who has been such a champion of military airlift, as well as a champion of an adequate civilian airlift, will continue to present this problem to the American people. In my opinion we are as short of airlift as we are of any other vitally needed defense equipment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague. I appreciate his leadership in this field as he has so ably demonstrated it in his support of the appropriation which was frozen.

Incidentally, while the armed services secured the \$140 million for airlift, it is said that we cannot afford to spend the money. We can afford, however, three \$5 million 707 jet planes which can be "plushed up" and used one for the President, one for the Secretary of State, and one in reserve.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me I should like to state it was the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico which took the action to which I have referred. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico, the committee approved the \$140 million for the airlift. I was a junior member of that committee. Though the action had the full approval of the committee, not one cent of the money was expended. I believe that is a correct statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I wanted to make. Someone is at fault, but surely it is not the Congress of the United States. The committee was not the only group to take that action. There was a unanimous judgment of the committee, and the Senate of the United States provided the airlift, which was supposed to be necessary.

Of course, all we can do is make the money available. We cannot make the administration spend the money, and it did not.

I feel that the Senator from Oklahoma is making a very great contribution. The best point is the fact that Congress itself has never been reluctant to proceed.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Congress is charged under the Constitution with the duty of raising armies and supporting them. That job has been done with the help of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Yet there is a production line at Long Beach, Calif., manufacturing the most modern cargo planes which our military people have today, operating on a half-time basis. The crisis in Berlin is not approaching us on a half-time basis; it is coming with the speed of sound. No one in the Pentagon, apparently, recognizes the present danger or is taking steps to meet it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to go a little further than the Senator is going in the present discussion. The Congress tried to provide, as was necessary, support for the National Guard. All the previous wars have been fought by men from the National Guard, from all the States of the country, and by men from the Reserves. So far as the Pentagon is concerned, those forces would be cut down, notwithstanding the fact that Congress provided enough money in the appropriation bill to take care of 400,000 National Guardsmen, whom the services are now trying to cut down to 370,000.

The same is true with respect to the Reserve forces.

This not only affects missiles and airlift, but it affects the National Guard and the Reserves, which mean so much to the defense of our country, to our security, and the security of the individual States.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said. I only wish there were some way the Congress could make known the feeling which I believe is almost unanimous on both sides of the aisle, that this administration must wake up; that it is later than we think; that America's danger is present, and upon us.

The best way to meet the problem is by beginning to at least get our muscles in a state of activity, so that we will have a position from which to bargain at the summit or at the foreign ministers' conference, instead of occupying a position of abject weakness.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In line with the argument the Senator is making, I wonder if the Senator agrees we should seek to avoid having to be constantly threatening to engage in a thermonuclear war. Such a war is likely to be a war of complete extermination of both sides. For us to go along reducing our conventional strength, leaving ourselves in the position where we may have to resort to desperate means, constantly putting ourselves at a greater and greater disadvantage, may cause an aggressor to feel we are only bluffing. When we talk about engaging in the ultimate war of extermination between two nations, any person should be and would be extremely reluctant to take such a step as that, and that is true of the Soviet Union as well as of this country.

Mr. MONRONEY. Anyone who does that may be called upon to put up or shut up at some place in the discussion.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that a religious country such as America, with the background of never having fired the first shot in a war, is going to be the first country to release the horror of the catastrophic deaths of tens of millions of people to keep the road open to Berlin. I should like to see us maintain a capacity to keep the road open to Berlin with conventional weapons and with an airlift, if necessary, because I would back up West Berlin. However, we fence ourselves in a corner from which there is no escape, when the Secretary of Defense talks about the overwhelming manpower superiority of the Sino-Russian group and admits our only weapon which might equal them is thermonuclear warfare.

Certainly Russia is not going to ignore the ability to put several divisions of good, well-equipped and well-prepared troops in the field, or to airlift other troops, equipped and ready to fight, in a Berlin emergency.

We do not have to go to the catastrophic route which would insure the outbreak of hydrogen world war III, but we

have put more emphasis on a balanced budget than we have on a balanced national defense. Before it is too late, almost daily on the floor of the Senate I think we must call attention to the failures which we are experiencing, to keep this Nation strong enough to sit down with Khrushchev on a basis approaching equality, and bargain for the kind of open avenue to Berlin which will maintain treaty rights and the moral and ethical right we have to keep our troops there.

Mr. LONG. The Senator heard the President's State of the Union Message, as I did. I gathered that the logic of that message related to limited wars, and that the President was suggesting that we should try, if possible, to limit the size of any war which might break out. I hope he did not have in mind that the only way to limit it would be by our losing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or by another Munich. This month is the 20th anniversary of Munich. We know from experience that when Chamberlain went to Munich, Hitler had the vision. He had an air corps. He had in being a tank corps, and Mr. Chamberlain and his umbrella made what he hoped would be "peace in our time." That was on September 30, 1938. Yet 6 months later, on March 15, Hitler completely abrogated the Treaty of Munich and began his march.

We know that conferences are not won by weakness, and that no matter how great the diplomatic ability of our negotiators, when the chips are down, the question which is decisive is, "How many divisions have we? Can we get them there ready to fight at the point of attack?" I do not wish to rely, as the Secretary of Defense apparently does, on only one weapon, namely, the hydrogen bomb and the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. LONG. Is it not usually the case, in conferences between two contending sides as far apart as communism and capitalism happen to be, the side which wins the conference is the side which has the most power when it goes into the conference?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR LIMITATION OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the program announced by the President for limitation on the importation of petroleum and its products into the United States.

I read from a press dispatch which has recently been written:

President Eisenhower today ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude, unfinished, and finished oil products.

The new order replaces a system of voluntary import controls which expires at midnight. Domestic producers complained the voluntary program failed and forced them to cut back their own production.

Capt. Matthew V. Carson, who will administer the new program, said it provides that, starting tomorrow, no crude or un-

finished oils may be imported into the United States unless by authorization of the Secretary of Interior.

Effective April 1, he said, no finished products, including residual oil used for burning, may be imported except by Government authorization.

Carson said finished products such as gasoline and jet fuel will be limited to 1957 levels. The program should substantially decrease the amount of oil and oil products imported into this country in the past.

The order was issued after the New York Stock Exchange had closed for the day.

The President said the great majority in the oil industry had cooperated with the Government in the voluntary quota system. But some importers, he said, had made it necessary to apply mandatory controls.

"The new program," Eisenhower said, "is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted."

The President said national security requirements made it necessary to adopt the controls. A surplus of oil, he said, has disrupted free world markets and would have spread to the United States except for the cutbacks in domestic production.

"Voluntary controls have been and a mandatory control will be flexibly administered with the twin aims of sharing our large and growing market on an equitable basis with other producing areas and avoiding disruption of normal patterns of international trade," Eisenhower said.

Carson said he did not believe the new program, of itself, would force price increases to motorists and consumers of fuel oil.

Eisenhower instructed the civil and defense mobilizer Leo Hoegh to advise him if price increases occur while the program is in effect and whether such increases are necessary to protect national security.

The new program announced by the President is the result of much study by the President's Cabinet Committee and has been concurred in by the President. I sincerely hope that it will work.

I hope that the industry and all concerned will make every effort to insure the success of the President's program. Certainly that will be my purpose.

If this program does not work, I believe the Congress itself must assume the responsibility to pass legislation that, by law, will limit total petroleum imports to the 1954 ratio between such imports and domestic production.

This program is in response to the authority and direction of the Congress on this subject first passed as an amendment to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1955. This act was further amended in the extension of 1958.

The Congress passed these two laws in lieu of proposals that were being made to the Congress for a more definite and specific restriction on these imports. I supported each of these proposals with the hope that, although they were not as specific as I had proposed, the solution to this problem could be accomplished through administrative effort.

I have been disappointed that the voluntary program established by the President did not accomplish this purpose. In fact, despite administration efforts, imports continued to increase under this system instead of decrease. As a matter of fact, currently imports are at an all-time high level.

At the time the first of the amendments attempting to establish this meth-

od was passed by the Congress in 1955, total imports were then in the neighborhood of 1¼ million barrels. Currently, total imports are more than 2 million barrels a day.

After a long and earnest study by the President's Cabinet Committee, resulting in a report in 1955, that Committee said imports in excess of their relationship to production that existed in 1954 would be harmful to the security of this country. Currently, imports are far in excess of this relationship.

Past experience has shown the voluntary approach is not effective. Thus, it is encouraging that the President has made the program mandatory and included refined products.

It is being reported that there is great consternation in our Western Hemisphere neighbors over establishment of this program. It is argued that such a program would have seriously damaging effects on the petroleum industries of Canada and Venezuela and as a result bring about reduced revenues to these countries.

I would like to point out that the current program does not determine where a company may purchase its foreign crude. If a company which has been importing oil from the Middle East would decide to shift its source of supply to Canada or Venezuela, there would be nothing in the program to forbid him to do so.

During the past year, however, the trend has been in the opposite direction, not because of any program instigated by the United States, but because economic advantage dictated that the cheaper Eastern Hemisphere crudes be substituted for previous purchases of Canadian and Venezuelan oil.

In 1957 importing companies brought into the United States 151,000 barrels daily of crude oil from Canada. During the last few months, however, these imports have declined to around 65,000 barrels daily. This reduction in the amount of oil imported from Canada has a direct relationship to the price paid for Canadian oil and that imported from the Middle and Far East.

This preference for foreign crude oil other than from Canada is even more pronounced when you consider that in 1957 imports into the west coast from Canada totaled 95,000 barrels daily. In 1958, this total dropped to 25,000 barrels daily despite the fact the Government's crude oil allocation for companies in that area normally importing from Canada was more than 75,000 barrels daily. In the last quarter of 1958 imports from Canada into the west coast totaled only 11,000 barrels daily, more than 65,000 barrels daily below the allocation. This decline took place despite the fact two of the importing companies have pipelines from Canada to their refinery gates.

Correspondingly, imports of crude oil from Venezuela were 531,000 barrels daily in 1957 and 433,000 in 1958. Whereas such imports from the Eastern Hemisphere increased from 304,000 in 1957 to 407,000 barrels daily in 1958. During the last 2 years, imports of refined products have steadily increased from all foreign sources.

The domestic industry has very greatly deteriorated—in direct relationship to the increase in these excessive imports—until today the ability of the domestic producer to drill needed wells has been greatly restricted and the number of wells drilled has, during this period, been greatly reduced. The trend has been fewer and fewer wells each year at a time when our demand is increasing. In Kansas, alone, in 1958 700 fewer wells were drilled than in 1954.

Mr. President, again I state I sincerely hope the program will work.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, can the Senator inform me how the present mandatory plan will compare, in the volume of the importation, with the 1954 ratio?

Mr. CARLSON. I regret to state that I cannot answer the Senator's question exactly. However, if I understand correctly, it goes back, according to the statement, to the 1954 level, with some exceptions.

Mr. LONG. As I understand it, it would permit, according to the Senator's statement, a level of jet fuel and gasoline in line with the 1957 import quotas.

Mr. CARLSON. Finished products and jet fuels would be on the 1957 basis, but crude would go back to the 1954 level.

Mr. LONG. Ever since the plan to control imports was put into effect, as the Senator knows, the plan did not control finished products, and there were tremendous increases in the importation of finished products from that date forward. I wonder how the overall ratio would compare with the 1954 situation, and what percent the new mandatory plan would control.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to read the first sentence of the press release:

President Eisenhower today ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude, unfinished, and finished oil products.

Knowing the junior Senator from Louisiana and his interest in this subject, having served with him on the Committee on Finance, I can state that he and I are in accord on this matter. I certainly hope that the new program will take care of the problem.

Mr. LONG. I hope it is in line with what Congress has recommended and with what the President's Cabinet Committee has recommended.

Mr. CARLSON. I agree. He and I have discussed this subject both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I commend the Senator for his statement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas. The administration has taken the right step in ordering mandatory controls. Many of us from States where the production of oil is a major industry have seen that industry decline and tens of thousands of people thrown out of employment by the flood of foreign oil importations. At first the administration put into effect some

voluntary controls, which I believe was in the middle of 1957. As the distinguished Senator from Kansas has said, the voluntary import program did not work, because some oil companies did not voluntarily go along with the restrictions on their imports.

Does the Senator from Kansas have the figures showing how the imports will be limited?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I regret to state that I have just picked this statement off the ticker. Therefore I have no actual knowledge as to distribution of the quotas. However, as has been stated in the colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana, I sincerely hope it will take care not only of the crude and finished and unfinished products, but that we will get back to somewhere near the 1954 basis.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not know of any person in an oil-producing State who wishes to cut off entirely the importation of oil, and thereby eliminate our trade with other nations. However, the importation of petroleum and petroleum products has gone forward at such an accelerated rate in the past 3 or 4 years, that the petroleum industry, particularly the independent producers, who have created the competitive situation in this country which permits American motorists to buy gasoline at 30 cents a gallon, whereas in Italy the motorist must pay 75 cents a gallon—and this in spite of the fact that the refineries are near the sources of supply in the Middle East—have been seriously injured by the flood of oil imports.

I wish to commend the administration for ordering mandatory controls. However, unless the mandatory controls are followed by restrictions on the domestic market, there will still be need to impose mandatory controls on the amount received from foreign producers; and as a cosponsor of the O'Mahoney bill I would urge the enactment of that bill to permit Congress to declare the degree of mandatory controls, unless the Executive order is enforced. Therefore, I believe it is still incumbent to pass a law to provide mandatory controls. Nevertheless the step the administration has taken is a step in the right direction, and is a step which many of us have long advocated. Therefore I commend the administration for taking this step. I hope the effect will be not to stop all foreign trade, but to cut the situation back to about to where it was 2 or 3 years ago before the tremendous flood of oil came into this country.

Mr. CARLSON. I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. Personally I have always favored voluntary controls. I have always hoped that they would work. In view of the fact that apparently we must have mandatory controls, I hope that the mandatory controls will be effective, particularly for this reason, namely, that they can be changed under Executive order. If Congress acts, on the other hand—and it may well have to act in the matter—a change is more difficult to bring about.

For that reason I hope we can have the cooperation of the oil companies with the Executive order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas for his statement on the proposed legislation, and to commend the President for acting in this situation.

This is a situation which all of us who live in oil-producing States know has been getting worse with the passing months. It is unfortunate that a comparatively few oil companies have thwarted the voluntary oil importation program, including that of finished products.

I believe the most significant statement in my opinion, and the one that I should like to underscore, if I may, with respect to this program, is the fact that during this period new exploration for oil and new wells drilled have dropped fantastically in the last 3 or 4 years. That situation is applicable not alone to the oil industry, but also to the mineral industry in general. The development of known reserves of minerals, and the searching out of mineral reserves and the finding of new reserves of minerals have fallen off, primarily because of the rather sick condition of our mineral industry in general. The same thing applies to the oil industry. I particularly underscore and applaud what the Senator has said with respect to the fact that the effect of all of this has not been just to make it hard on our independent oil companies to compete, and has made it hard on the whole oil industry, but that it has also served to stop exploration for new reserves in this country, which, in my opinion, is one of the worst effects it could possibly have.

Mr. CARLSON. I compliment the Senator from Colorado for the statement he has made. He is familiar with our problem in the Midwest, and we in the Midwest know how much the importation of oil has affected drilling, which is important not only for the future of the Nation but for our national defense as well. The Senator from Colorado has always taken a very active interest in this problem, and I commend him for it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas upon the excellent statement he has made. I should like to ask him if the Presidential order imposing mandatory quotas applies to the imports of residual oil.

Mr. CARLSON. I read from the release, which is all I have to speak from:

Effective April 1, no finished products, including residual oil used for burning, may be imported except by Government authorization.

That is all I have on the subject.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has called to the attention of the Senate an important action by the President of the United States. I do not wish at the moment to express any view with respect to this action except to call to the attention of the Senator from Kansas the fact that the foreign tax credit operates as a subsidy to the processing and importation of oil from foreign sources. This tax loophole, this tax favoritism, is a subject to which Congress should give immediate attention. Not only does it affect oil; it affects the operations of many of our corporations in the foreign field.

The able Senator from Kansas and I serve on the Committee on Finance together. He and I together have learned of tax returns which show that some corporations have been making millions of dollars a year in foreign operations, but are paying not a single dollar to the United States Government in taxes. I hope this disclosure will serve to call attention to the unjustified treatment of profits earned in foreign countries.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has brought up a subject which has received considerable discussion in the Committee on Finance. I assure him it will have more. The Senator from Tennessee is entitled to much credit for pursuing this matter diligently, not only in the committee but outside the committee. I commend him for it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I again commend the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas for his original report and for his comment on the situation, which is brought to the attention of the Senate again by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee.

We know the nature of the arrangement worked out in Saudi Arabia between the Arabian-American Oil Co. and the Government of Saudi Arabia. The company pays no royalties, but is taxed at the rate of 50 percent of its production. That 50 percent, by arrangement with the U.S. Government, is credited on the income tax in the United States. So although ordinary corporations in the United States pay a 52-percent tax on income; while domestic independent oil producers in the United States pay a 52-percent tax on their income; the tax on the income tax paid to the United States by ARAMCO is 2 percent.

We sent our Navy and Air Force to that region to protect the investment of ARAMCO, but their taxpayment to the U.S. Government, if anything, is not in excess of 2 percent. Is not that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Texas has well expressed the situation. I assure him it will receive greater consideration in the committee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Therein lies a great injustice. It works to the detriment of the small, independent companies in the United States. The com-

panies producing oil in foreign countries are not paying their fair share of taxes to the United States. They are paying virtually no taxes to this country. It is an unfair condition. I hope Congress will remedy it before the end of the session.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to join with those who have complimented the Senator from Kansas on his contribution to the solution of a problem which is important to many portions of our land and, I think, to the Nation as a whole.

In my State of Wyoming, where oil provides us with our largest single income, it is also critical in the State's economy. In the matter of the last 3 or 4 days, I have just learned, from a quick swing around the State, and can report first hand, if any more reporting is needed, that the independent producers in particular are suffering because of what has been the policy of the Government up to this time. We hope we can pursue this effort, because of what is suggested by implication in the mandatory policy outlined by the administration.

We compliment the Senator from Kansas for his presentation, and the administration for its stand on the problem.

I call attention to that which the Senator from Kansas knows even better than I; namely, that when the chips are down, as we say, we cannot, on the floor of the Senate, suddenly announce that we must have more oil, when we are cut off from our overseas supply of oil. Oil is brought in only after many years of exploration. For that reason, we must plan ahead.

We stress against the importance of projecting a farseeing policy which will not find us wanting or cut short in days of a more critical nature which may face us 2, 5, or 10 years from now.

I wish to associate myself with this meritorious action today.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wyoming has very well described the situation which prevails in all the oil-producing States. In the interest of the welfare of the Nation and from the standpoint of its defense and economy it is important that we have a program which will permit continued exploration for oil.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] what is the parliamentary plan of the leadership for tonight?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret to advise the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have not discussed it with the leadership. Earlier in the day it was suggested by the leadership that it was hoped to conclude action on this bill today and to make the Hawaiian statehood bill the unfinished business. Whether that is still the plan of the leadership, I am not advised.

The Senator from Oregon can suggest the absence of a quorum, get the majority leader to the floor, confer with him and the leader of the minority, and perhaps obtain a more definitive statement of the aims and purposes of the leadership. I have not consulted with the leadership concerning how long it is planned to have the Senate remain in session this evening.

I apprehended, when I saw the podium placed over the desk of the Senator from Oregon, that it might take some little time longer to conclude action on the bill than I had hoped. I say that without disparaging the quality of the Senator's remarks, which are always erudite and informative.

Mr. MORSE. I should be glad to accommodate the Senator from Georgia and have him listen to my speech tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I can say with some authority that it was hoped to finish action on the draft bill today and to make the Hawaiian statehood bill the next order of business for tomorrow. The order to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow has already been agreed to.

Let me respectfully ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether he anticipates speaking at considerable length.

Mr. MORSE. Well, the word "considerable" is a very flexible one. I shall speak at some length.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask, with all proper deference, whether the Senator from Oregon will speak for more than 1 hour?

Mr. MORSE. At the present time I expect to speak for an hour, and I do not know how much longer. That will depend on what develops during that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator's remarks possibly last 2 hours?

Mr. MORSE. The best judgment I can give the Senator from Illinois is that my remarks will take at least 1 hour. But I want the Senator from Illinois to understand that I am not making any commitments or giving any assurances.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want commitments or assurances; but I thought that, for the convenience of all Members, it might be well to have the Senator from Oregon state what he anticipates.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I said that, only for the convenience of the Members, since it is now 6 p.m.—the leadership might wish to have the action on the bill concluded tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield, without losing the floor, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum—in the hope that we can take a moment to dispose of this question?

Mr. MORSE. Only for future reference, because I have not expectation of participating in debate of that kind. But in order to avoid the establishment of a precedent which might be cited in the future, I should like to obtain a parliamentary ruling on the question of whether, if I yield at this point, what I have said thus far will count as one speech by me on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). That might be prevented by the giving of unanimous consent that it not be counted as one speech.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the Senator from Illinois will ask unanimous consent that I not lose my right to the floor if I yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I do not intend to engage in a prolonged debate on this subject. But, Mr. President, in my 15 years in the Senate I have never had as heavy a heart as I have when I speak tonight.

So far as I am concerned, it makes no whit or bit of difference to me how many Senators remain to listen to my remarks, because I shall be speaking for the RECORD. But, as the leadership knows, I always try to accommodate my colleagues, particularly when the hour is late.

Unless there is some reason why the bill must be voted on tonight, then, for the accommodation of my colleagues, I suggest that I make my speech tonight, and that the vote on the bill be taken tomorrow. I am always willing to enter into such an understanding.

But before any vote on the bill is taken, I wish to state, for the RECORD, some of the facets of the subject matter. I propose to raise them in the course of my speech tonight, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, because I believe the RECORD should show perfectly clearly that, at least, these points were raised before the vote on the bill was taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon may be permitted to let a quorum call intervene, and that he will not thereby lose the floor, and that such remarks as he has made and the fact that he has been recognized by the Chair will not constitute recognition for the purpose of one speech, under the Senate rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desires to speak on the pending amendment. The

yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment. The Senate will also take a yea-and-nay vote on the question of the passage of the bill.

I am informed that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will speak at some length.

Therefore, in view of the fact that there has already been entered an order for the Senate to convene at 10 a. m. tomorrow, I believe I should announce, for the information of the Senate, that we do not expect to have any yea-and-nay votes taken this evening. We expect to have the Senate vote as early as possible tomorrow on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and then to proceed with the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall proceed when there is order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

COMPARABLE ISSUES DEBATED IN 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, I speak with a heavier heart tonight than at any other time when I have risen on this floor for a discussion of any subject matter in my 15 years of service in the Senate.

In 1948 we also had before the Senate a bill for the extension of the draft. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the excerpts from a series of three speeches which I made in 1948 in that debate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is present. I remember very well that I was sitting on his side of the aisle at that time. We discussed some of the same issues that I intend to raise in this debate in 1959, which present an interesting comparison, and also show, sadly enough, how little we have progressed in the field of this subject matter since 1948.

At that time, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I offered a series of amendments. The RECORD shows that in connection with the subject matter of some of those amendments, we reached some compromise positions here on the floor. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as the RECORD shows, was kind enough to express his gratitude and appreciation for my position and the help I sought to render in respect to some of the 1948 problems.

In order to save time from any lengthy reference now by way of quotations from the 1948 RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published as a part of this speech certain excerpts from the debate in 1948 on the issue of extending the draft at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a rather fitting background to the speech that I shall make tonight to take the Senate back to the RECORD of June 9, 1948, in the course of which speech I said:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were

convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are enjoying a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possible strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since V-J Day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I digress from the quotation to say that not long after that we were in the Korean war.

To continue from my speech of June 9, 1948:

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something

is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "that is as far we shall go." I think Russia is beginning to read the stop signs which we have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I

said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance that our ideals and objectives are peaceful is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

Mr. President, that was June 9, 1948. Those words are as applicable today.

In an analysis of some of the things which have and have not happened since 1948, there will be found at least part of the explanation as to why the world tonight is alarmed about the possibility of war.

There were other statements in the debate of 1948, which, under the agreement I have already obtained, Mr. President, I shall put in the RECORD later. I shall discuss them in the light of some of the things which have transpired in the last few weeks in the Congress, through the briefings we have received in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. They give me great cause for concern as to whether America's policies will avoid war.

Now is the time to analyze America's policies, irrespective of the tempo of public opinion and disregarding the propaganda of America's Military Establishment, because on the shoulders of 98 Members of this body and on the shoulders of the Members of the House of Representatives, I believe, rests the greatest power for peace in our country and possibly in the world.

DEFENSE NEEDS REQUIRE CAREFUL STUDY,
NOT HASTE

But it calls for reflection by Congress. It calls for an insistence upon the adoption of a "stop, look, and examine" attitude on the part of the Members of Congress.

I think we have a bill before us tonight which calls for much more examination by the Members of the Senate before they vote than has been given to it up until this hour.

As this draft extension bill has proceeded rapidly through the legislative mill, I have regretfully come to the conclusion that once again we are being confronted with the ultimatum-type legislation. We are being told that we must pass a 4-year extension of the draft because the Berlin crises threatens, and the Congress must not show any signs of retreating in the face of force.

Yet, in extending the draft for 4 more years without change or correction of its critical inequities because of a crisis which threatens us momentarily, the Congress is, in effect, being stampeded. We are expected to write something into law for 4 more years because of conditions which prevail at the moment, and may or may not prevail for the next 3 months.

I find little in the hearing record placed upon our desks to justify the bill in its present form as an essential long-run component of America's national defense. In the House hearings the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Personnel and Reserve, Mr. Finucane, was asked why the 4-year period was requested, rather than a shorter one of perhaps 2 years. He replied:

I think your question is a good one, sir. Historically, the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years; and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past.

I have come to expect that mental attitude from those in the Pentagon Building. But it should not prevail in the Senate. I am not interested in the extension of any legislation at any time for conformity's sake. Legislation should be extended on its merits, or it should not be extended at all.

We had this issue before us in 1948. Before concluding, I shall offer two amendments to the bill. The first leaves no question in regard to the termination date.

I now send to the desk the first amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table, and be made available to Senators tomorrow. It is an amendment to House bill 2260, in line 6 on page 1, to strike out "1963" and insert "1961."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of the amendment is to tie down with certainty the duty of the Congress to reexamine the draft law in 1961. I fought this fight in 1948, when the Senate approved my amendment reducing the extension to 2 years. I am satisfied that in the years ahead, as we look back over the record in support of a 2-year extension and a 2-year extension only, history will justify the recommendation I make tonight.

We have no stronger evidence than the record of the House Armed Services Committee from which it recommended a 4-year extension of the draft, with no

review required by the Congress before 1963.

INDICATIONS ARE THAT DRAFT IS OBSOLETE

In my judgment, we are being asked to take a legislative course of action which is not in the best interests of peace nor in the best interests of the security of my country, nor in the best interests of the millions of young men who will be brought under an obsolete system of military manpower.

I am at a loss to understand why we have a proposal for a 4-year extension of the draft, when even the printed record shows that the spokesman for the Pentagon, when asked why a 4-year extension was being requested, rather than a 2-year extension, replied:

I think your question is a good one, sir. Historically the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years; and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past.

That reason is not good enough for the senior Senator from Oregon, and I do not think it is good enough for the American people. We should do a better job of representing the American people and legislating for them than that kind of reasoning would premise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator's proposal also include a manpower study commission during the 2-year period? I know that the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] relates to that subject; and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] addressed himself to the same subject matter. It had been my intention to suggest such a proposal. I have in my folder a draft of a proposed amendment. I am deeply moved by the evidence before the committee. I read the record of the hearings before the Senate committee, as well as the record of the hearings in the other body. There were extensive hearings in the House of Representatives.

I have been concerned over the use of manpower by the military, and by what are considered to be the inequities of the system, as well as the inadequacies of the system in terms of manpower utilization.

I believe, if I am correctly interpreting the purpose of the Senator from Oregon, that what he is recommending is that the draft be extended for 2 years, and that during that period of time there be a critical and constructive reexamination of the manpower policy relating to our national security. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct. That leads me to a subject which I did not intend to discuss at this time. I shall refer to it only briefly now, and discuss it later in my speech in greater detail.

My second amendment is an amendment to the Case substitute. The Senator from South Dakota has just offered a modifying amendment to his amendment, which in my judgment makes the amendment better, but not good enough.

I shall offer an amendment—and I will put it in proper form to send to the desk later—to eliminate entirely from section (b) of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, which calls for the creation of a Commission on Military Manpower, and provides that certain members—six, I believe—are to be appointed from civilian life and confirmed by the Senate, the provision that one member shall be appointed from the Armed Forces in active military duty.

For reasons which shall be expressed in some detail later in this speech, I am opposed to the appointment of a single member of the Commission on Military Manpower from those in active military duty. The job of those at the Pentagon Building is to carry out the policies of the Government, not to create them.

**CIVIL CONTROL OF MILITARY AND FOREIGN POLICY
SHOULD BE MAINTAINED**

As I shall show in greater detail later, I am greatly concerned about the degree to which, in this democracy, we are turning over policymaking to those in the Pentagon Building. Such a trend must be stopped, in my judgment, in the interest of self-government.

It must be stopped in the interest of preserving democratic procedures and processes. It must be stopped if we are to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States in regard to the place of the active military in the operation of this Government. I am very fearful that we are much further down the road toward undue military influence in operating the Government than is good or safe for democracy.

I will not support the extension until at least I have done my best to eliminate military policymaking from the organization of any manpower commission, because a manpower commission will use the Pentagon and its personnel for information and witnesses. They should not be given a vote in determining the policy of this Government while they are actively engaged in the military. I am not going to do it even to the extent of one member.

The Senator from South Dakota has greatly improved his proposal by changing it so that of the seven members of the Commission, only one will be an active military official. My amendment would eliminate that one, for reasons which I shall discuss later in my speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to much of the presentation of the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I feel that the suggestion he is making, that is, the theme and the purpose of his Commission, is surely very creditable and desirable, and something that we should put into effect. As the Senator from Oregon has so well pointed out, the basic manpower policy relating to our national security, which goes deeper than merely the military, is something which ought to be decided by civilian authorities of the Government. In the instance of the Commission, it seems to me that at least

the Commission ought to have full civilian orientation.

The Senator's amendment for a 2-year extension surely should be understood as being designed to provide adequate manpower for our defense. I would not want the record in any way to indicate that the limitation of 2 years would in any way weaken our military strength. In fact, I believe that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota both agree that the military at the present time is inadequate to the responsibilities our Nation faces.

I regret that yesterday I was not on the floor of the Senate to associate myself with the remarks of some of our distinguished colleagues on the importance of having adequate plans for the forces in our Military Establishment, and the importance of the administration keeping the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force up to the strength authorized by Congress.

On the one hand, Congress lays down what it believes to be policies which are required for the defense of the Nation—and that is the prerogative of the Congress under the Constitution—and on the other hand, the President, acting through the Bureau of the Budget, cuts the military forces, even though Congress has determined, after extensive hearings, what the size of such forces must be for the national security.

I, for one, protest that kind of false economy, that kind of rationalization, that kind of economics in connection with our national security, and that kind of putting the so-called threat of inflation ahead of the threat of the power of the Communist military and economic machine.

It is deplorable and indefensible. I do not wish my remarks today, in support of the thesis and proposal of the Senator from Oregon, to be interpreted as anything but a desire basically to strengthen our manpower policies, rather than to weaken them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his constructive contribution to my discussion of the matter. The Senator from Minnesota knows me well enough to know that I completely share his point of view that whatever we do on the military manpower issue should be done with the objective in mind of strengthening the security of our country, not weakening it.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that the proposed amendments I am offering are offered on the basis of my very deep conviction that my amendments will give us a stronger security than we would have if we were to pass a bill which did not require a reexamination and affirmative action at the end of 2 years, and instead perpetuates an inadequate system for 4 more years.

When I get to that section of my speech I intend to say something about the proposals of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. In view of what the Senator from Minnesota has said about the comments of the Senator from South Dakota earlier this afternoon, I wish to say that I believe the Senator from South Dakota has made a great contribution on

a high level of statesmanship in the debate on military manpower in his remarks today.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota for a commission on military manpower has an objective which ought to receive the enthusiastic support of Congress. We may differ—as I have expressed my difference—on some procedural details for the establishment and the operation of the commission, but I do not see how we can think of not adopting some such program, perfected, if we can perfect it, as recommended by the Senator from South Dakota.

In my judgment, the Senator's proposal ought to set a termination date for the draft and require reaffirmation by Congress at the end of that termination date of 2 years.

On page 2 of his proposal the Senator from South Dakota states:

(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports, and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

AMENDMENT FOR 2-YEAR EXTENSION

It may be said with some merit that obviously that language implies that on January 31, 1961, Congress will have before it at least the subject matter of the report which will make it easy for it to proceed to reexamine the draft. However, I much prefer that we get specific language into proposed legislation which automatically ends the draft, as the amendment I have sent to the desk would do, in modification of the bill before us, and then decide, at the end of that 2 years, what kind of manpower program we ought to have, taking into account the report of the Commission which the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would create.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First of all, I should like to say that I appreciate the comments which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota have made with respect to the purpose of my amendment. What bothered me about the consideration of the extension of the draft, both in the House and in the Senate, was that it seemed to me it was being moved forward without as much time as I should like to have seen devoted to the study of the subject in committee, and without allowing reaction time, so to speak, for the country to realize that this matter was being considered and presumably would be disposed of. Therefore I felt it was important to say something about the imperfections of the Draft Act in its operation and administration, with the view of at least getting an opportunity for the Senate to register an opinion that there ought to be an improvement and that we ought not merely affirm the need for improvement and the existence of errors or inequities in the administration,

without taking some step toward correcting them.

Personally I have no objection to having the entire commission a civilian commission. The draft of the amendment originally, as I said, came from another member of the Committee on Armed Services, and in his form he proposed a commission to consist of four civilian members and three military members from the Pentagon. In deference to the idea that he had in mind, and in the hope that perhaps it might develop a little more support, I felt that changing the composition of the commission to six civilian to one military would be much better than a relationship of 4 to 3.

So far as I personally am concerned, I would prefer to see it an entirely civilian commission; and as to that portion of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Oregon, I would support it. However, I think in view of my discussion with some other Senators on the floor, I should leave the amendment as I now have it modified—6 to 1.

While I am on my feet, I should like to say also that I listened with interest to the first part of the Senator's discussion this evening, when he reviewed some of the things he said in 1948 concerning the wisdom of our taking a new look at the developing strength, the developing military intelligence, and the attitude of the Russians generally. I think we would have been wise had we heeded that advice at that time. I do think that some of our problems today are an outgrowth of our failure to recognize a development which was taking place in Russia—educational development, scientific development, and industrial development. Had we properly educated ourselves or recognized, perhaps, what was there for us to see at that time, some of our problems today would be small.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to ask either the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from South Dakota: Did the Committee on Armed Services consider this proposal, and did they vote on it? The Senate has a unanimous report from the committee. I should like to know from the Senator from South Dakota if his proposal was considered and voted on by the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The matter was discussed within the committee. There were more than two members of the committee—perhaps 3 or 4 members, at least—who by discussion indicated some support for the idea. But the amendment was not put to a formal vote. It was not formally presented for a record vote or for a yeand-nay vote in the committee. I think the discussion indicated that it would not carry, and the person who brought up the matter decided not to present it formally in the committee for a vote.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think that was unfortunate, because there is a good chance that it might have been adopted had it been presented in the light in

which it is now presented in the Senate. I for one certainly hope the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will consider accepting the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are rendering a service to the Senate and to the country in developing the subject of the continuation of the draft. I remember, in 1948, at about this time of the day, hearing the able Senator from Oregon speak eloquently upon this subject. On that evening he expressed his concern that the Senate was coming to believe it inevitable that the draft should be continued.

I remember that I spoke that evening against an indeterminate draft period, saying that the draft was not a part of the American tradition. As I remember tonight, I voted with the Senator from Oregon to limit the extension of the draft to 2 years.

Today we are in a much more difficult world situation, but whatever my vote will be—and it must be for extension—the considerations which these two able Senators have brought before the Senate and the country this evening are important, for they bear on our total foreign policy. Whatever may be the outcome of the vote, whatever may be the gravity of our situation in the world today, I am glad that the Senators are rendering this service to our country.

Mr. MORSE. I remember very well the great contribution which the Senator from Kentucky made to the debate in 1948. I appreciated then, as always, his support on an issue which I felt was not fully understood within the Senate, and, therefore, at the moment was not very popular.

The Senator from Kentucky did support me in the position I took in 1948. I think our debate was helpful in many ways which do not show on the surface in connection with the military manpower policies of this country.

I quite agree with the implications in the statement of the Senator from Kentucky that when a question such as this one is raised, which is all mixed up with feelings about national security and the threat of Russia, it is very easy to be misunderstood. Therefore, his words of commendation for raising the issue tonight are very much appreciated by me.

The Senator from Kentucky is one of the fair-minded Members of this body, before whom I always feel I will get a hearing on the merits. He and I may end in complete disagreement on the merits; but I always feel that when the Senator from Kentucky listens, I am talking to an open mind which is perfectly willing to give fair consideration to the point of view I wish to express.

I am not sure but what we have already just about reached the point in our country where it is almost impossible to get reasoned judgment on the part of many of our people on an issue

which is so pregnant with deep psychological reaction, namely, the matter of national security in relation to Russia. I shall say something about that general problem later, because these things are all intertwined.

The fact is that we have on the floor of the Senate tonight not only an armed service problem but a foreign policy problem, as well. We cannot separate the work of the Committee on Armed Services and the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations on at least 95 percent of the subject matters with which those two committees deal.

That is why now, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with my background of experience as a member of the Committee on Armed Services for a good many years, I want to try to focus attention on what I think are some of the interrelationships. Even in our era we can follow a course of action which will result in our winning a horrible war and losing our destiny. That is why I do not favor quick action on any of these subjects.

Returning to the bill, because of the crisis atmosphere in which the bill is being considered, it is proposed to freeze for 4 years a totally inadequate defense manpower situation.

Every careful study of national defense about which I know—at least, those we have been permitted to know about—has stressed the inadequacy of the present selective service program in furnishing the manpower which will be needed by our country over the next several decades.

The kind of manpower which we need is that which is highly skilled and trained in the complex instruments of modern warfare, and which is best furnished by career servicemen. The truth of the matter is that the draft has been a military manpower expediency crutch on which the country has been leaning for too long a time.

The cry is raised one must vote for this bill or be universally condemned as being soft on communism. I am surprised at the editorial slant of many of America's newspapers in the last several days.

STRONG DEFENSE NOT ACHIEVED BY DRAFT

Mr. President, it has reached the point where a Senator who disagrees with the policies recommended by the administration in the field of defense or in the field of foreign policy must expect to be hit with the charge that he must be soft on communism.

But the fact is that those of us who are asking for the most penetrating, critical analysis of the policies of the Government in respect to our armed services and our defense problems and our foreign relations are doing so because we want our country to be strong enough at all times to meet the Russian threat, and to be able to do so by means of a course of conduct which will strengthen the peace, and will not necessarily bring on a war.

I am very fearful that many of the policies of my Government do not at this time strengthen the chances of peace, but that, instead, they increase the danger of war. That is why I speak out.

Mr. President, I challenge the contention that those of us who raise questions about extension of the draft are soft on communism, because I do not think the needs for the national defense are being adequately served at all by the draft.

There is nothing wrong with those who are drafted; but there is a great deal wrong with a system which brings them into the military service at the lowest possible level, usually without regard to their skills, gives them the elements of military training—but not the kind of proficiency in modern warfare that the Nation really needs its Armed Forces to have—and at the end of 2 years returns them to civilian life, from which they have lost 2 valuable years, without even making provision for their education and training following that service.

From the point of view of the young men who are involved, I think it is a sheer scandal to continue to draft men into the armed services without providing them with education and training benefits when they leave.

But from the point of view of the country and its long-range defense needs, I see in the bill, as it is now before us, provisions for a 4-year extension of a system which we shall rely on only at our peril, inasmuch as the bill makes it impossible to obtain, during those 4 years, a manpower program which will assure the Nation strong, well-trained Armed Forces capable of protecting the Nation and its interests over a period of many years, and probably decades, of Communist threat and menace.

What I want for our country's armed services is skill and expertise. But under the draft, such skill is not provided, because the drafted men serve for only 2 years. The proposed extension of the draft is, of course, a penny-pinching way of providing for the national defense. The military forces thus obtained can be obtained more cheaply than it is possible to obtain well-trained career forces of equal numbers.

It is no reflection on the young men we are discussing to point out that they could give the country better service as career soldiers than they can as drafted soldiers, to whom military service is but a duty to be performed and gotten out of the way as quickly as possible and as easily as possible.

The obsolescence of the draft should cause us to stop, look, and investigate, and to ask whether this is the time—at this hour of new emergencies arising on the international horizon—for us to do no more than extend the status quo, or to face up to the military manpower needs of the country, and to proceed with a proper program and the funds it requires, so as to obtain the skilled military personnel we shall need if we are to meet the continuous threat from Russia on the military front.

I think the story we find is a pitiful one, when we make a case study of the men drafted, and see what is done under the draft with the potential skills of those who are in our Military Establishment.

If we were to translate those losses into dollars—and, of course, they are subject to some evaluation from the stand-

point of financial value and financial loss—I am satisfied that we would find that with each year's operation of the draft, we waste hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of lost personnel services in relation to the potential competency of those who are drafted. In many, many cases—in fact, in tens of thousands of them—the manpower drafted is not used where it should be used.

This criticism has been before us for years. It will be found in the 1948 debates. But the record of the Pentagon since 1948 is one of gross failure to bring about the reforms which should be made in respect to this problem.

We remember that in the 1956 campaign, a few of us discussed the need for a great revision of the country's draft policy. Adlai Stevenson discussed it. I discussed it many, many times in the course of my campaign—as did other candidates in 1956. Of course, it was supposed to be impolitic, but I asked, "So what?"

THE STATUS QUO IS NOT SUFFICIENT

It is a matter of vital concern to the people of the country and to the national welfare. But here we are in 1959; and what we have before us now is, to all intents and purposes, a proposal to continue the same errors—not a proposal that augurs well for any reform in our military manpower policy, but a proposal to continue the status quo.

A great paradox is to be found in the argument that we must do this because we must show Russia that we mean business. I have no doubt that the Russian leaders probably know better than most of the people in our country the shortcomings and inefficiencies of the American draft system. I am satisfied that if the draft is extended, tomorrow, for 4 years, no concern will be caused in Russia. Extension of our draft is not going to put Russia in any greater jeopardy than she is now, and I think Russia knows that perfectly well.

If we really want the Russian leaders to raise their eyebrows about America's military defense program let us proceed with a military manpower program, not with a draft, but one that will build up a skilled, career American military service of able technicians, well trained, on a career basis, for the development of our country's defenses. That is essential, because in the field of science those defenses are ever changing.

That kind of career military personnel would make some impression on the Russian leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY EXPERTS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED

All this talk in the debate as to how important this draft bill is, from the standpoint of Russia, is highly fallacious. I think it is, for the most part, a discussion that will lull the American people into a false sense of security. I do not think the 4-year extension of the draft is going to give the American people the security to which they are entitled; but the correction of our military manpower policies, which have been recommended now for some years by various experts who have gone into it, is the line of approach which I recommend to the Congress.

"Oh," it will be said, "Mr. Senator, why do you go along with any extension of the draft, then?" I would not if we had the manpower proposal before us that we ought to have before us, and which ought to have been prepared by now. I think the Commission called for by the Senator from South Dakota ought to have been established by now. Then we would be passing, tomorrow, on a military manpower bill that would really come to grips with the needs of this country's defenses so far as military manpower is concerned.

But certainly, Mr. President, I do not think we ought to extend the draft beyond the 2-year period. Instead, I believe we should use the next 2 years to revamp our military manpower program, as called for in the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and put the recommendations into effect even before the end of the 2-year period, if possible.

Mr. President, under authority previously granted, at this point in my remarks I ask that there be printed a portion of my argument which appeared on page 7325 of the RECORD of June 8, 1948. This is a summary statement of my position on my amendment at that time to limit to 2 years the extension of the draft legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to summarize my position on the amendment by briefly answering the major arguments used against my amendment this afternoon. They were rather interesting arguments, but if I were trying a case I would say most respectfully that most of them would fall under the objection of being irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential.

One of the arguments made earlier in the debate this afternoon was that 2 years from now might find us at the end of the session with such a congested calendar that we could not give careful consideration to the question of whether or not we should continue the draft. I think that is not a very sound argument, because I do not know how a bill could receive any more careful consideration or go through a longer hearing, or receive more hours of attention from committee members than we have given to this bill. I answer the argument that we may not have time 2 years hence to consider this problem, Mr. President, by offering a record of the Armed Services Committee over weeks and weeks of hearings on this bill in this crowded session of Congress as my exhibit A in complete rebuttal of that argument. We can take judicial notice that this issue will always receive thorough attention by Congress.

Second, I am privileged to say, because several Senators have said to me in the cloakroom they are inclined to go along with the committee report, that a good many members of the Armed Services Committee, of which I also am a member, have reconsidered very carefully the provision of the bill for a 5-year draft and have decided to vote for my amendment. I am privileged to say that at least five of us on the Armed Services Committee intended to vote for my amendment for a 2-year period instead of a 5-year period. I say that because I want the Members of this body to know that there has been a considerable amount of rethinking about the provision within the Armed Services Committee, and there is not on this provision, as there is on most sections of the bill, a unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee.

I want to see the obligation and responsibility placed upon the Congress to review

at the end of 2 years the policy now being adopted, and at that time decide whether or not we want to continue the draft. I think it will be found that after 2 years our reserves will have been built up, and that we shall have done a pretty good job of educating the American people to an understanding of the need for supporting an adequate Military Establishment.

The last point is, my amendment is in line with action already taken by the House. The House voted a 2-year provision. I think, Mr. President, we should follow in this instance the action taken by the House, and adopt my amendment.

Following this statement of my position there appears on page 7326 the rollcall votes by which the Senate adopted my amendment limiting the extension of the draft to 2 years. It reads as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Baldwin], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bushfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jenner], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. White] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Baldwin] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Taylor] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. Downey], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Thomas], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Wagner] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	McCarthy	Taft
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Malone	Umstead
Eastland	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hill	O'Connor	Young
Hoey	O'Daniel	

NAYS—33

Ball	Hawkes	Martin
Brewster	Hayden	Myers
Cain	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Capper	Holland	Reed
Cordon	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Lodge	Saltonstall
Eaton	Lucas	Smith
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McGrath	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Downey	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Hatch	Tobey
Bricker	Jenner	Wagner
Bridges	McCarran	White
Bushfield	Magnuson	
Connally	Taylor	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment lettered "G" was agreed to.

To continue, Mr. President, on page 7568 of the RECORD of June 9, 1948, there appears the following exchange:

Mr. MORSE. I want to make one statement in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, because I know his devotion to accuracy. I think the comment he made concerning the reduction of the life of the bill by my amendment yesterday, from a 5-year to a 2-year basis, with the right of Congress at the end of the 2 years to vote to continue the draft if it was considered that an emergency existed at that time, seems to give the impression that the majority of the Armed Services Committee was against that amendment. The record is perfectly clear that 7 of the 13 members of the Armed Services Committee voted for the 2-year amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the House?

Mr. MORSE. No; in the Senate yesterday afternoon. A majority of the members of the committee, after thinking over the matter, decided to support the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I find the Senator from Oregon is correct in that statement. I had assumed before the Senator from Oregon corrected me that such was not the case. I find I was in error.

Mr. MORSE. I have talked also to those men, and they have told me that after thinking the whole thing through, with the right of the Congress to continue the draft after 2 years they thought the amendment was a good amendment. They represent a majority of the Armed Services Committee. The fact remains that a majority of the Armed Services Committee voted for the amendment.

To conclude the excerpts from the 1948 RECORD, Mr. President, I cite now, in part, my remarks which may be found on pages 7579 and 7580 of the June 9, 1948 RECORD as follows:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are "enjoying" a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since V-J Day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United

Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "That is as far as we shall go." I think Russia is beginning to read the stop signs which we

have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national-defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance—that our ideals and objectives are peaceful—is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to

develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

With the precedent of 1948 as my background, Mr. President, I shall urge tomorrow the adoption of my similar amendment this year to limit to 2 years the extension of the draft.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk another amendment, amending section (b) of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to H.R. 2260, and ask to have it printed and available to the Senate tomorrow. I will say to the gentlemen at the desk, that if it needs any perfecting, it will be understood that I shall do so when I close my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to offer his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I do not want it called up; I want it printed and at the desk, ready to be called up tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, as modified will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

CONGRESS LOSING ITS EXCLUSIVE WARMAKING POWER

Mr. MORSE. Now, Mr. President, I want to discuss this problem in relation to a broader facet, because I do not see how we can come to grips tomorrow with a military manpower piece of legislation and not give some thought to the relationship of it and our other defenses to present trends in American foreign policy.

Every Member of the Senate knows, but it ought to be restated and emphasized for the RECORD, that article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides the powers of Congress, and one of them is that Congress shall have the power to declare war. I am afraid, however, Mr. President, there is a great danger that that section of the Constitution may become a dead letter.

As I listen to witnesses from the Pentagon Building and witnesses from the State Department before the Foreign Relations Committee, I am filled more and more with the fearful thought that we have already reached the point in our history where there is a lack of full appreciation of the meaning of that section of article I, section 8, of the Constitution—that it is the Congress which has the power to declare war.

I am very fearful that there are forces of subterfuge at work in America today in regard to article I, section 8, of the Constitution. I am fearful that there is not a full appreciation, either at the Pentagon Building or in the State Department, or the White House, of the meaning and full implications of article I, section 8, of the Constitution—that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

That language becomes empty, Mr. President, if officials in the Pentagon Building and the State Department fol-

low policies under which we shall wake up, some second, to discover we are at war, and that the Government comes to Congress only to ask Congress to make it official.

It has been said among my colleagues that war is inevitable. They have not said it for the record yet, but I have heard colleagues take the position, as recently as this morning, that we are not entitled to know what the policies of the Pentagon Building and the State Department are in respect to the Berlin crisis.

Yet, those policies mean the difference between war and peace, and those policies can determine whether or not we will be at war at any given moment.

So long as I am in this body, I do not intend to remain silent when I believe any section of the Constitution is being defeated by subterfuge on the part of any executive agency of this Government. When I sit in the Foreign Relations Committee and listen to some of the testimony given in recent weeks by high officials of both the Pentagon Building and the State Department, I find it impossible to escape the conclusion that the American people ought to know. And the American people are not being told. But they will be the ones who will be dying by the millions if we get into a war through an administration's back door rather than as a result of open debate on the facts prevailing at the time consideration is given to a resolution for a declaration of war.

Of course, not one of us would fail to vote for a declaration of war after any horrendous act of aggression had been committed against us. We all know that.

But this is a different world from even the world of 1917. This is a different world from even the world of Pearl Harbor. We are now living in a time when one miscalculation by the generals at the Pentagon Building or by the State Department might place us in a war situation, so far as acts are concerned, and I think we have just about reached the point tonight where we are suffering from the bankruptcy of the massive retaliation policy of the Secretary of State.

Last Thursday in a speech in the Senate I said that no one could pray more sincerely than I for the recovery of the Secretary of State from his illness, because I wish no misfortune to any man. But, Mr. President, I am as much opposed to the policies of the Secretary of State in the field of foreign relations as I have ever been, and we are being treated now in the Berlin crisis to a part of the inevitable cost of that course of action. Time and time again his policies have been American unilateral policies. Those policies on the part of the United States time and time again have been policies circumventing the United Nations, and they have been policies, on some occasions, as I think history will show, outside the framework of international law.

WHOLE WORLD HAS A STAKE IN BERLIN

They have been policies which have alienated millions and millions of people throughout Asia and Africa, some of whom are beginning to make known their views.

Those people, too, have rights in Berlin. They do not have treaty rights, Mr. President, but they have rights to peace. They have rights to live, which the course of action which Russia and the Western Powers follow may very well take away from them.

I say to the leadership of India and the leadership of the free nations of Asia and Africa tonight, "Make your voices heard before it is too late. Raise your voices, and quickly, because the danger is that the leaders of the Western Powers and of Russia may take a course of action in the next few weeks which history will record as the most immoral chapter in the history of mankind."

I weigh my words solemnly tonight, Mr. President. A nuclear war cannot be justified by my country or by Russia. It is immoral, and it cannot be squared with the Almighty's wishes. After all, the greatest allegiance we owe is to God, and the generals in the Pentagon Building of the United States have no right to follow an ungodlike course of action.

When I listened to an American general sit in a committee room and tell me and the other members of the committee that we should be more cynical about Russia, that we should recognize that it is impossible to negotiate, and that we must face up to the fact that sooner or later we shall probably have to drop everything we have—meaning, of course, our nuclear weapons—I was aghast, I replied to him, "If we follow that philosophy and that course of action, then the only group ahead in this great struggle will be the archeologists 1,000 years from today when they dig up the ruins of the sorry record we made in 1959."

Of course, I am for making clear to Russia, Mr. President, that we do not intend to be intimidated by her threats. I am for making clear to Russia that if she makes an attack upon us in connection with the Berlin crisis, we shall meet force with force. Although we have some shortcomings in our defenses, I want to say, in support of the generals at the Pentagon Building, that I think we are in a military posture where Russia is not going to win a war of any type, conventional or nuclear.

Of course, we will win in one sense, either Mr. President, as I indicated the other day, when we are through with all the destruction, and when we shall have let loose the awful nuclear destruction in storage today, the resulting radiation will irreparably damage human life and animal life in a large part of the world—undoubtedly practically all of Russia, all of Europe, probably all of the United States and Canada and at least the north tier to the south of us, and part of Asia—for several thousand years.

NUCLEAR WAR IS A MORAL ISSUE

That raises the moral issue. That raises the question of the rights of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Those people are not involved in the dropping of those bombs, Mr. President.

They have a right to insist, I submit, that Russia and the Western Powers proceed now with a course of action which will reduce the danger of letting that terrible radiation loose on the face of

this earth, which radiation will linger on, so the scientists say, for several thousand years doing damage to all forms of animal and plant life.

I do not know of any time when all of mankind were ever confronted with a moral issue of such proportions. So it raises, from a philosophical standpoint, the issue of sovereignty. Oh, how easy it is in our country for people to wrap our great flag around them or wave it to tatters, in a great, superpatriotic appeal about sovereignty. We had better recognize, before it is too late, that there is really a greater sovereignty. I would call it the sovereignty involved in the reign of peace. Mankind has reached the point of scientific development where each individual owes it to society to follow a course of action that leads to peace, and not to war.

What is the position our Government takes today? Who knows? However, I think it is fair to say that the best we know is that we are going to play it by ear. We are going to consult with other Western Powers. We are going to be willing to negotiate; and we are going to give them the work, if necessary.

The first atomic bomb that Russia or the United States, or any of the Western Powers drops will for centuries alienate the friendship of those who survive in Asia and Africa. That is why I say to the leaders of the nations not involved in Berlin, "Raise your voices now. Now is the time for you to speak out to the Western Powers and to Russia. Now is the time for you to make clear to the Western Powers and to Russia that they have no moral right to follow the policies they are already following in regard to Berlin."

In my judgment the Western Powers and Russia have no right to treat the Berlin crisis as their problem. It has become the problem of mankind. It has become the problem of all civilization.

UNITED STATES SHOULD HAVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE THROUGH UNITED NATIONS

When we speak with high officials in the State Department and respectfully ask, "What about the United Nations?" what reply do we receive? "Eventually we may get to the United Nations." My question is, "If eventually, why not now? Why not now?"

I think we have seen enough to know that the policy of brinkmanship is too dangerous when we wait upon the maneuverings between the Western Powers and Russia, because I believe that both Russia and the Western Powers are following a policy of brinkmanship; and it is slippery, dangerous business.

Incident after incident may occur. We cannot have this kind of jockeying; we cannot have this maneuvering for position; we cannot have armed forces in the air maneuvering as they are now maneuvering, without the danger of falling into the possible catastrophe which I heard the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, speak about in December 1957, in New Delhi, India, at the Parliamentary Conference of the Commonwealth Nations, when he pointed out, in a memorable speech, that one of those bombs may go off either by design, by reason of disobedience of orders, or by accident.

But once one goes off, there will be no time to find the answer to the question "Why?" The nuclear war will be on, and Russia and the Western Powers for all of history will be convicted by their own mutual acts—inexcusable immorality and crime against mankind.

Neither the United States nor Russia can under any circumstances justify the dropping of an atomic bomb, in view of the nuclear power now in storage under the control of Russia and the United States. No moral nation can justify it; and our people are both moral and deeply religious.

I say to the State Department that underneath this great crisis is a deep spiritual issue. It is an issue involving our faith and spiritual values. No man-made misbehavior, demonstrated through the official acts of any nation, can justify, on moral grounds, letting loose on the face of this globe nuclear radiation which for several thousands years would visit upon mankind the horrendous consequences about which I have spoken.

There is the spiritual problem. I know the kind of rebuttal to expect. "But it will be a rebuttal of rationalization. It will be a rebuttal of moral escapism. It will not be a rebuttal that one can take into the confessional of his own conscience and, in the presence of his God, offer as either an excuse or an explanation for such an immoral course of conduct."

I apply this thesis to what is a great danger in my country tonight—that we have within this Government men who, I believe, think that a preventive war is unavoidable.

I do not propose to give such military officials any policymaking power. That is one of the reasons that I shall offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], to make any manpower commission 100 percent civilian. We must make clear to the American military, in the weeks of crisis immediately ahead, that this Government is to be controlled by civilian policies, not by military policies.

We must insist, in my judgment, that we be told more of the facts, if the military have any facts, in regard to what their plans may be in respect to meeting the Berlin crisis.

I suggest that a much more moral course of action than the one we are now taking would be one in which my Government would issue a call to the leaders of the world to put into operation immediately the procedures of the United Nations. We have a great opportunity to demonstrate to the millions in Asia and Africa who doubt our protestations of peace that we are now ready to submit the whole case to the United Nations. The procedures are available in the United Nations.

When officials of the State Department tell me that at some time in the future they may consider a step which takes into consideration the procedures of the United Nations, my answer is, "That is not good enough for my country."

Now is the time to use the procedures of the United Nations. It is said, "You

must go through the procedural steps of the Security Council." Yes; that is correct. Let us go ahead and do it. We might be surprised, although I do not think so. However, let us get that behind us.

Let us get Russia into the position where she throws her veto on the Security Council. That will be of great value in the formulation of world opinion. Assuming that she does—and I believe in all probability she will, judging by the past record of Russia walking out on her moral obligations time and time again as a member of the Security Council—we shall then have available the General Assembly and the peaceful procedures which the sections of the charter provide in relation to the workings of the General Assembly.

I believe that the best forum for the discussion of the Berlin crisis is not behind the closed doors of secret diplomacies, but out in the General Assembly of the United Nations, where other peoples from other countries have an opportunity to speak for peace in support of their rights.

INTERNATIONAL COURT SHOULD TRY BERLIN CASE

Then we have the judicial processes of the United Nations. When we are told by the State Department that international law supports our decision, they are right; they do. That is all the more reason, Mr. President, why we should use the judicial processes of the United Nations to pass judgment on such agreements, and proclaim to the world who it is that is violating the agreements in respect to Berlin.

Of course, Mr. President, when we stand before the bar of justice as a litigant or as a party advocate, we are in a somewhat different position than we are when we go into a closed-door session of international secret diplomacy and engage in an attempt to obtain from our opponent on the other side of the table an agreement affecting the entire world, without the rest of the world having a voice in the agreement which is worked out.

I believe that era of international negotiations has just about come to an end. The time when powerful nations—in this instance, to use an example involving the Berlin crisis, Russia, Great Britain, United States, France, and Germany—think they can get into a negotiation situation and enter into some kind of understanding which will affect millions of people who are not parties to that understanding, or, failing to reach such an agreement, breakdown in those negotiations and lead the world into nuclear war, is long past, and that idea has already been repudiated in history.

The world certainly is one in relation to the issue of war and peace, and no two nations can any longer fight unto themselves alone; nor will they.

FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Therefore, I believe we should make clear that we do not propose to be intimidated by Russia. I also believe that we should make clear that we intend to lay this problem immediately before the United Nations for exercise of its

procedures. We ought to make clear that we would welcome support for that approach from other nations. I am sorry that I think it is true—and it is true—that there are leaders in other nations who will remain reticent, who will hold back, and who will not make their views known so long as the United States and our Western allies and Russia talk about trying to negotiate some understanding of the Berlin crisis.

But I think they would welcome an indication on the part of the Western Powers that their services for peace through the operation of their rights in the General Assembly of the United Nations would be appreciated.

My views on this subject can be summarized by saying that I believe the State Department has put the cart before the horse, so to speak, in regard to the approach it is making to the Berlin crisis. We are putting the last extremity, first, when the steps we ought to be taking now are United Nations steps.

Here we are illustrating once more that this great organization, which was chartered by its signatories to do what it could to prevent war and promote peace, is not being given primary consideration.

The appeal should be made to it now. It should not be kept in the background until the situation becomes so bad that no organization could save the peace. Then there would be those who would say, "You see, any association of nations for promoting peace is a mistake. No association can prevent war. It cannot prevent war." It is true that it cannot. The powers proceed with a course of action which will get us into war, in reality, through the back door before an appeal can be made to have the United Nations use its procedures, reach decisions, and place restrictions upon the wrongdoers.

FOUR-YEAR DRAFT EXTENSION OFFERS ONLY FALSE SECURITY

One more word, and I shall be through. What does this subject have to do with the draft bill? A great deal. I think the draft bill itself is being offered really as a part of a mistaken policy on the part of our country that war can be prevented by seeming to take warlike steps. But war will be prevented only when we carry out the great teaching of Arthur Vandenberg, who used to plead on the floor of the Senate for the establishment of an international system whereby the rule of law would settle our disputes.

I say frankly that up to this hour, my conclusion in regard to the attitude of both those in the Pentagon Building and those in the State Department is that they give only lip service to the idea of settling international disputes which threaten the peace by the application of a rule of law, because the State Department cannot point to a single instance in which the peace of the world has been threatened, and in which it has proposed and urged that the dispute be submitted to the judicial process of the United Nations for a binding determination for or against us, or even an advisory opinion.

That is one of the reasons why the leaders of the Asian and African nations

to which I have referred tell us quite bluntly, and into our teeth, when we meet with them, that there is much difference between our record as a nation in the field of following the rule of law and our record in professing it.

Oh, Mr. President, if we followed such a course of action as I have suggested, who knows what system might be developed through the application of the rules of reason to Berlin?

I do not intend to discuss on this occasion, but shall on another, the national psychological problems which are involved in such a crisis as this; the face-saving problems; the necessity for compromise; the part that a request for time and the adoption of a program based upon the passage of time plays in the ultimate settlement of international disputes.

All those practicalities exist, Mr. President, but I also know that when we get issues out into the open for public disclosure through a body which has jurisdiction, and when rules of reason can be applied to them, the chances of a settlement leading to peace are greatly improved.

So I offer as a hope, perhaps, that such an approach as I have suggested may eventually lead, for example, to the formation of a United Nations trusteeship—any other descriptive term may be used—for the administration of a tinderbox spot of the world, such as Berlin. We have missed too many great opportunities in our country in recent years to apply such a principle. That is why in 1955, together with former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York, I made a plea for the application of such a program to Formosa. We had an opportunity then to propose the proper procedure for the administration of Formosa, with the United States undertaking the caretaker duty of defense until such time as the United Nations found it possible to dispense with the trusteeship, whether it required 25, 50, 75, or even 100 years. I think we missed a great opportunity there, as we have in other parts of the world.

There has been such an accumulation of mistakes of that nature that now we may be confronted with our last opportunity to make a plea to the leaders of the nations of the world for the adoption of United Nations jurisdiction over all the countries involved in the Berlin crisis concerning their respective interests in Berlin.

But if we do not follow that course of action, and if what I consider to be the present mistaken policies of the State Department or the Pentagon continue, then I pray, at least, that we shall have heard the last of any talk in our country against the leaders of Russia and of the Western Powers getting together directly and personally with their foreign ministers to try to settle the dispute.

The other nations of the world are entitled at least to that privilege. The other nations of the world have certain rights of peace, to which I have alluded. To the head of state of my country and of any other Western Power and of Russia, I say that not a single one of them, alone or collectively, has the moral right

to fail to sit down together in a meeting with their foreign ministers. I do not care whether it be called a summit conference or whatever else it may be termed. But they had better get together rather than waste precious time with international diplomatic maneuvering while all mankind is poised on the brink of a precipice from which, if it falls, most of civilization will fall with it.

Many of the thoughts which I have expressed in my speech tonight are inherent in any intelligent consideration of the kind of military manpower bill which the Senate will pass tomorrow, because such legislation will be inseparably entwined, so far as its implications and effects are concerned, in the foreign policy of my country for the next few years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Although there are some points in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Oregon with which I might find myself in disagreement in some respects, I think the Senator has made a very outstanding contribution to the current debate upon the foreign policy of the United States and upon the debate, which is worldwide, on the subject of the future of civilization—certainly the future of peace in our time.

I regret that there was not a larger attendance at this time of the day to hear what the Senator from Oregon said. With his indulgence, and the indulgence of the employees of the Senate, who have patiently waited until this hour. I should like to make a few observations concerning some of the things which the Senator from Oregon has said.

Mr. MORSE. I will yield the floor, so that the Senator from South Dakota may proceed in his own way. I thank the Senator for listening to me until the end of my speech. As he knows, I never ask for agreement. It is not agreement that I ask, but that the American leaders and the American people, before it is too late, think about the problems which are involved, and about what I think is the greatest threat to my country which we have ever faced. This is how serious I think the situation is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first, in commenting on the direct issue presented by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to state that I am glad he raised the moral issue, for I, for one, agree completely with him that a moral issue is involved in the questions confronting the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and the other nations of the world.

I am also glad the Senator from Oregon pointed out that nations other than the so-called Big Four have a stake in the decisions made with respect to Berlin. I hope that those who are in a position to do so will convey to the leaders of those nations, such as India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and the countries of Africa, the point the Senator from Oregon has expressed tonight, namely, that they, too, have a stake in these issues and have expressed tonight; namely, that they, countries which are perhaps directly involved in the initial decisions made.

I believe a moral issue is presented, inasmuch as the world might be thrown into a nuclear war. I have that feeling not merely with respect to the Berlin crisis; I had the same feeling with respect to the Quemoy crisis of a few months ago. To me, it came as a distinct shock when I heard representatives of the Defense Establishment say that, under certain circumstances, the thing to do, if the shelling of Quemoy continued, would be to go all out in a nuclear war; that a conventional war would be merely a war of attrition which we might win or we might not win or, at least, we might not win decisively. Personally, I was shocked to hear the suggestion that the only thing to do at the outset would be to go into a nuclear war.

I do not know on what authority those whom I heard make that statement were speaking, or whether they were expressing only their own opinions. But, to me, it was unthinkable that we should unleash a nuclear war over Quemoy or over whatever Quemoy might represent in its relationship to Formosa, for I, too, agree that our country could never escape the moral judgment of this generation if our country were the first to use nuclear weapons at the present time, whether over Quemoy or over Berlin.

So I hope the moral implications of such a decision are kept in mind by whoever makes the decision in this instance.

Second, I wish to say this with respect to the leadership of Mr. Dulles: I am familiar with the statements the Senator from Oregon has made on prior occasions with respect to the policies followed by Mr. Dulles and those followed by the President of the United States in conducting our foreign policy. I wish to say that it should be to the everlasting credit of Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles that they took the position they did in the Suez crisis. I felt that those two gentlemen, as the leaders of our country responsible for our foreign policy, said, as it had never before been said, that the rule that territory taken by aggression should not be recognized should apply to our friends, as well as to those who have not been our friends. I think that is one of the landmarks in the development of international policy by justice and fair play.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from South Dakota to know that I completely supported the position the President and the Secretary of State took on the Suez crisis. We remember that at that time they also pointed out to the then belligerents that they were acting outside their responsibilities in relation to the United Nations. I thought that position was unassailable. I only wish they had taken the same position in regard to some matters in which the United States was directly interested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have the feeling that when the long story of man's attempt to es-

tablish in international relations the rule of law and the principles of justice is written, our policy in regard to the Suez crisis will be hailed as one of the great steps forward, and something from which future leaders can take encouragement.

Third, I wish to mention the policy of the President of our country. I am glad that Dwight D. Eisenhower, rather than some other persons I might mention, is President of the United States, if chances of using nuclear weapons are involved in some of the decisions that are made.

Personally, I am convinced that he has shown more restraint than some others might have shown, or more than some others might use or show in future situations.

With regard to the Formosa resolution, I shared to some extent the feeling that we should have written into that resolution a more positive reliance upon the procedures of the United Nations. However, I recall that the night when we voted on the Formosa resolution, I stated that one reason why I would vote for the resolution was the letter the President had written, in which he stated that he would use the processes of the United Nations so far as possible in that connection.

Next I wish to mention the Berlin situation. I shall do so only briefly.

The able Senator from Oregon has made an interesting suggestion tonight, although not necessarily a new one; namely, that the procedures of the United Nations be applied to the Berlin problem. But certainly he has presented that matter in a more forceful way than I have heretofore heard it presented. By what I am about to say, I would not detract one iota from his presentation.

The Berlin situation cannot be considered entirely apart from the historic background in which it was created. The quadripartite administration of Germany, following World War II—the plan under which the land of Germany was divided into four zones, and the capital city of Berlin divided into four sectors, with one zone assigned, respectively to Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States, and one section of the city similarly assigned—cannot be wholly ignored; nor can the modification of that quadripartite agreement—namely, when Britain, France, and the United States decided to proceed with the recognition of West Germany, even though at that time Soviet Russia was not ready to enter into a peace treaty with East Germany—or the step toward solution taken with the abandonment of occupation by the four powers be wholly ignored.

However, after we made our unilateral decision—unilateral insofar as the West was concerned—Russia then made her decision to create the puppet government in East Germany. At that time we could hardly protest too much on that score, because we had already recognized the West German Government.

I may have an imperfect recollection in regard to the next phases of those matters—namely, the questions which in both instances were left undecided.

Among those, my memory suggests that the status of Berlin, as such, was left undecided; and the unification of Germany or any method for its unification was left for future determination; and the question of how, and in what manner, communication between the West and the Western sectors of Berlin might be preserved was left for future determination.

Because a solution of the present Berlin problem hinges upon finding some answers to those questions which were unresolved at the time when West Germany and East Germany were established, it seems to me only natural that the State Department should initially seek to arrive at answers to those questions among the powers which, following World War II, were parties to the original four-power handling of the German question.

So I trust that the Senator from Oregon will not be too impatient if the first and initial exploration of a solution of the problem is sought among the four powers, rather than through a procedure of the United Nations. The problem was started within the four-power agreement, and it would be natural that the first solution should be sought there.

Reverting to the general theme of the major part of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon tonight, I wish to express a hope. It is that when the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, comes to this country, the attitude, the climate of opinion in the United States will be receptive, and not hypercritical. I express the hope that when the Prime Minister comes here and gives us the benefit of his recent trip to Russia, we shall not take umbrage at the fact that a leader of another great power should have taken the initiative in making an exploratory trip to Russia.

I personally hope when he comes he can bring to the people with whom he will confer some information which has not appeared in the front pages or has not been publicly discussed, and that will indicate the avenues through which agreement and solution of the problems confronting the world at this time may be reached.

If it is not carrying the deep sentiment which I felt was expressed in reference to the moral issues involved too far, I should like, in connection with my reference to Mr. Macmillan, to recall that on an occasion in the history of England when people were disposed to think that the answers to problems should be found in politics and great navies, a poet philosopher of England wrote some words which, it seems to me, the world might well read today. I read them now. It was in the "Recessional" which Rudyard Kipling wrote:

God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

The tumult and the shouting dies—
The Captains and the Kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

Then this stanza, Mr. President:

Far-called our navies melt away—
On dune and headland sinks the fire—
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

To all who may hear or read in these days discussions about massive retaliation and power politics, I recommend this stanza:

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boastings as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

To those of us who may occasionally be a bit self-righteous and think that the only wisdom and the only concern of the world and of humanity rests with the so-called Christian nations, I read the final stanza:

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy Mercy on Thy People, Lord!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from South Dakota that if my remarks did no more than elicit from him the contribution he has made to the RECORD tonight, I shall be well repaid for the speech I have made. Such disagreement as I may have with the Senator from South Dakota in regard to the Berlin situation I think can be stated very simply as follows:

I am well aware of the fact that the misunderstandings or differences which have arisen among Russia, France, Great Britain, and the United States, and now western Germany, grow out of the agreements which the powers entered into. Of course, it is understandable that an attempt should be made to resolve the disagreements which have arisen over the agreements. My point is that I think the parties have already reached the point where the rights of other nations now must be recognized and where other nations should intervene.

That is the reason for my suggestion that Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, and West Germany should present their case now, on the basis of any agreements they can reach, to the only tribunal which, in my judgment, exists for the settlement of this dispute in the interest of peace, namely, the United Nations. Raising this question with the United Nations now would not prevent the leaders of Russia, Great Britain, France, West Germany, and the United States from reaching any new agreement they can.

Many of us have seen party litigants over a boundary dispute almost reach the point of carrying guns, unable to reach any agreement even with the aid of counsel, but in the judicial atmosphere of a courtroom, where they must appeal to the rule of reason and present evidence to support their case, we have often seen them reach a settlement. If the United Nations were to make it clear that it proposed to exercise jurisdiction, it might provide the greatest enhancement to the prospect of the

party litigants themselves reaching agreement over the Berlin crisis.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the fine contribution which the Senator from South Dakota has made. No greater reference in literature could be found than his reference to Kipling and to the rich philosophy entailed in that beautiful piece of poetry.

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to extend a courtesy to the Senator from South Dakota and have him take the floor at this time, without my losing it, so he can modify his amendment, with the understanding that his statement will either follow or precede my statement in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment, that my amendment may be modified in this respect:

In subparagraph (b), after the first word, "President," insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Then, in the same paragraph, to change "four" members to "six" members, and change the figure "3" to "1."

The effect of that modification is to make sure that six members of the commission shall be appointed from civilian life, and only one from the Armed Forces, and that all seven members shall be subject to Senate confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the modification will be made, and the amendment, as modified, will be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I make that request at this time in order that my amendment, when printed tonight, may appear on the desks of Senators in its modified form.

I also ask unanimous consent that these remarks follow the colloquy with the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF MINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FOR BERYL, CHROMITE, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM FROM DOMESTIC MINES—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF THE BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 1245) to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines, introduced by me on March 2, 1959, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO TOMORROW AT
10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously en-

tered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel, vice Edward B. Lawson.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Cecil P. Milne, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

J. Allen Overton, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1962, vice Edgar Bernard Brossard, retiring.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice J. Ernest Wilkins, deceased.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Henry J. Friendly, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Harold R. Medina, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Lloyd F. MacMahon, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Lawrence E. Walsh, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, O18655, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Jack William Schwartz, O17823, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Franklin Fearing Wing, Jr., O18107, U.S. Army.

Col. Clarence Renshaw, O17708, U.S. Army.

Col. William Warner Harris, O18170, U.S. Army.

Col. Chester William Clark, O41908, U.S. Army.

Col. Gines Perez, O30126, U.S. Army.

Col. Elmer Louis Littell, O29823, U.S. Army.

Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, U.S. Army.

Col. James Leslie Snyder, O19627, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19216, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer to be assigned to position of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be general

Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, he has nominated them for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy.

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be admiral

Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., U.S. Navy.

To be vice admiral

Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, U.S. Navy, retired.

NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.

H. R. 2260

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 10 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1959

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the amendment by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, as modified, to the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, viz: Strike out section (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

- 1 (b) The Commission shall be composed of seven mem-
- 2 bers who shall be appointed by the President within sixty
- 3 days after the effective date of this Act. Seven members of
- 4 the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and
- 5 confirmed by the Senate. The President shall designate one
- 6 of the members of the Commission appointed as Chairman.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION
H. R. 2260

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. Morse to the amendment by Mr. Case of South Dakota, as modified, to the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

March 10 (legislative day, March 9), 1959
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 89

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 10 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1959

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, viz:

- 1 On page 1, line 6, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu
- 2 thereof "1961".

3-10-59—C

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2260

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. Morse to the bill (H. R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

MARCH 10 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1959

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

H. R. 2260

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 10 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1959

Modified and ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the provisions of the act of Aug. 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, viz: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

1 COMMISSION ON MILITARY MANPOWER

2 SEC. . (a) There is hereby established a Commission
3 to be known as the "Commission on Military Manpower"
4 (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Commission")
5 whose function it shall be to carry out the provisions of sub-
6 section (f) of this section.

7 (b) The Commission shall be composed of seven mem-
8 bers who shall be appointed by the President, by and with

1 the advice and consent of the Senate, within sixty days after
2 the effective date of this Act. Six members of the Commis-
3 sion shall be appointed from civilian life and one from per-
4 sonnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty. The
5 President shall designate one of the members of the Commis-
6 sion appointed from civilian life as Chairman.

7 (c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its
8 powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the
9 original appointment was made. Four members of the Com-
10 mission shall constitute a quorum.

11 (d) (1) Each member of the Commission who is not
12 otherwise in the service of the Government of the United
13 States shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the per-
14 formance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimburse-
15 ment for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses
16 incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

17 (2) Each member of the Commission who is an officer
18 or employee of the United States shall receive no additional
19 compensation for his services as a member of the Commis-
20 sion, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and
21 other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance
22 of the duties vested in the Commission.

23 (e) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix
24 the compensation, without regard to the civil service laws

1 and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such per-
2 sonnel as it deems necessary to carry out its duties.

3 (f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make
4 a comprehensive study and investigation of—

5 (1) the operation of the Universal Military Train-
6 ing and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the
7 programs of procurement of military personnel by the
8 Armed Forces;

9 (2) means and methods of improving utilization
10 and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

11 (3) alternatives to the system of induction of civil-
12 ians for military training and service as a method of
13 maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

14 (g) The Commission is authorized to secure directly
15 from any department, agency, or independent establish-
16 ment of the Government information, statistics, data, sugges-
17 tions, and other matter for the purposes of this section; and
18 each such department, agency, or independent establish-
19 ment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the fore-
20 going matter directly to the Commission upon request of the
21 Chairman of the Commission.

22 (h) The Commission may from time to time report to
23 the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961,
24 submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the

1 results of its study and investigation together with such rec-
2 ommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall
3 thereafter from time to time make such further reports and
4 recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission
5 shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

6 (i) Expenditures of the Commission shall be defrayed
7 out of funds appropriated to the Executive Office of the
8 President.

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. Case of South Dakota to the bill (H. R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the provisions of the act of Aug. 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

MARCH 10 (legislative day, MARCH 9), 1959

Modified and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued March 12, 1959
For actions of March 11, 1959
86th-1st, No. 39

Appropriations.....	18,38
Area redevelopment	
.....	1,6,14,30
Budget.....	43
Buy-American.....	40
Claims.....	18
Contracts...11,19,40,47,49	
Cooperatives.....	26
Economic report.....	50
Education.....	25
Electrification	
.....	10,16,27,47,49
Expenditures.....	38
Farm program.....	21
Fisheries.....	33
Flood control.....	23
Foreign aid.....	5,28
Foreign trade.....	36
Forestry.....	9,22
Grain.....	45
Grants-in-aid.....	12

Great Lakes compact.....	42
Hardwood plywood.....	36
Inflation.....	8
Military training.....	3
Milk.....	17,29
Nominations.....	13
Organization.....	44
Personnel.....	20,34
Price supports.....	4,24,45
Prices.....	41
Public debt.....	7,32,43,48
Research.....	11
Roads.....	22
Security investigations.	34
Statehood.....	2,15,39
Surplus food.....	5
Textiles.....	31
Turkeys.....	46
Unemployment.....	6
Water compact.....	35,42
Water resources.....	37
Water utilization.....	10

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee ordered reported area redevelopment bill. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized price support payments to large producers. Senate passed Hawaiian statehood bill. Sen. Byrd and others submitted and Sen. Byrd discussed measure providing for one general expenditure authorization bill.

SENATE

1. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported, by a vote of 9 to 6, with amendments S. 722, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas. p. D152
2. STATEHOOD. Passed, 76 to 15, with amendments S. 50, to provide statehood for Hawaii. Agreed to the committee amendments. Agreed to amendments by Sen. Jackson "intended to correct grammatical and typographical errors" in the bill as reported. pp. 3411-16, 3426-75
3. MILITARY SERVICE. Passed, 90 to 1, as reported H. R. 2260, to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. pp. 3402-11

4. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized price support payments to large producers, rejected the argument of "those who have tried to claim that the Government does not lose money but in effect makes money on the price-support loans because they are always paid off," and stated that "Congress should long ago have repealed the high, rigid price-supports program, and should have adopted a more flexible program, as has been advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture." pp. 3422-3
5. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Kennedy inserted an address by Rep. Bowles, "A Fresh Look at Foreign Aid," in which he urged greater use of surplus foods in our foreign aid program. pp. 3477-82
6. UNEMPLOYMENT. Sens. Humphrey, Langer, Randolph, and Hart discussed the unemployment situation, and urged the enactment of area redevelopment legislation to help alleviate this situation. pp. 3419-22
7. PUBLIC DEBT. Sen. Humphrey expressed concern over "the huge amount of money to be spent in interest payments on the public debt," and inserted an editorial, "Why the Treasury is in Trouble." p. 3419
8. INFLATION. Sen. Wiley expressed his concern over inflation, and inserted a list showing the estimated cost of certain bills being considered in Congress. p. 3402
9. FORESTRY. Received a Utah Legislature resolution opposing the enactment of proposed Wilderness Preservation legislation. p. 3395
10. WATER UTILIZATION; ELECTRIFICATION. Received a Mont. Legislature resolution urging the enactment of legislation to authorize and provide funds to start construction on the Yellowtail Dam, Mont. p. 3395
11. CONTRACTS; RESEARCH. Received from GSA a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture, or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test during the last 6 months of 1958. p. 3392
12. GRANTS-IN-AID. Received a Mont. Legislature resolution urging that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid by the public of Mont. be retained in the State, and that a reduction of 15 percent be made in Federal grants-in-aid connected with State legislative appropriations. p. 3393
13. NOMINATIONS. Confirmed the nomination of Elmer F. Bennett to be Under Secretary of the Interior. pp. 3390
The Banking and Currency Committee reported the nomination of Karl Brandt to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. p. 3390

HOUSE

14. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Dulski urged support of area redevelopment legislation to alleviate unemployment. p. 3486
15. HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD. Adopted, 337 to 69, a resolution for debate on H. R. 4221, the Hawaiian Statehood bill, and began debate on the bill. pp. 3487-3503
16. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Jensen inserted his statement before the Public Works Committee contending that the TVA private-financing bond proposal is "an attempt to bypass the Appropriations Committee and to eliminate the control of elected

president of the University of California, at a convocation at Pomona College.

Several editorials regarding proposed labor-management reform legislation.

Several editorials commenting on the anti-bombing bill introduced by him and Senator ERVIN.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Winning script prepared by Leandro Lombardia, Jr., Jesuit High School, Tampa, Fla., in 12th annual voice of democracy contest.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Editorial entitled "False Economy," published in the Messenger-Index of February 19, 1959.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

Editorial commenting on price support program, and published in the Wall Street Journal of March 3, 1959.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Editorial entitled "Report of Work and Progress," published in the Bakersfield Californian of Monday, February 23, 1959, referring to the Forest Service fire record in California.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Article published in SDX News for March 1959, and an editorial published in the Quill for March 1959, both relating to the death of Marion H. Hedges.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Article entitled "They Liked Kennedy in Jackson County," written by Albert McCready, and published in the Oregonian of March 9, 1959.

Article entitled "Labor Report," written by Stan Weber, and published in the Oregon Journal of February 22, 1959.

By Mr. MOSS:

Article entitled "No Antiboss Hatred for This Top U.S. Unionist," dealing with David John McDonald, president of United Steelworkers, published in the Canberra (Australia) Daily Telegraph of January 22, 1959.

By Mr. WILEY:

Booklet entitled "Farm Cooperatives and the Record," published by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington, D.C.

Resolution opposing communism, adopted at a meeting of Americans of Lithuanian Descent of Kenosha, Wis.

By Mr. ERVIN:

Letter from Miss Chloe Gifford, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, commending Senator McCLELLAN as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

By Mr. LONG:

List of students and chaperons from the University High School in Baton Rouge, guests in the Senate Chamber on March 10.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Article entitled "GOP Problem as Nixon Sees It," written by George Todt and published in the San Fernando Valley Times of February 26, 1959; also an editorial entitled "What Future for Republicans?" written by George Todt and published in the San Fernando Valley Times of February 27, 1959.

Statement by Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, regarding the right-to-work legislation.

By Mr. KEATING:

Article entitled "Messages of Freedom," written by Oliver Bell, and published in World Week for January 16, 1959, dealing with efforts of the American Committee for Liberation to reach people behind the Iron Curtain.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address entitled "A Look at West Virginia," delivered by Mr. Frank Lile Taylor, Jr., before the Civitan Club, of Charleston, W. Va.

Extract of press account of address of Mr. Theodore C. Fearnow on the subject "Area Development," before dinner sponsored by Lions Clubs of Hardy County, W. Va., on February 11, 1959.

ABOLITION OF FISH TRAPS IN ALASKA COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, news which will be greeted enthusiastically by Alaskans was contained in an announcement this week by the Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, that he has included in Alaska commercial fisheries regulations this year a provision abolishing use of a device known as the fish trap. This fish trap abolition order is for Alaskans the best news to come out of Washington—I mean Washington, D.C., and not the State of Washington—the best news since the Congress passed the Alaska Statehood Act last year.

The departure of the fish trap from our waters is long overdue.

The fish trap in the almost unanimous view of Alaskans is a monopolistic device which more than any other thing has led to the tragic depletion of what once was Alaska's greatest natural resource and the greatest national fisheries resource, the Pacific salmon.

For some 50 years Alaskans have watched helplessly while the great salmon fisheries administered 100 percent by the Federal Government has gone down, down, down.

Alaska was the only Territory that by the Organic Act passed in 1912 was denied the right to manage and control its fisheries. Lacking jurisdiction over this resource, Alaskans could only urge and plead for the abolition of the traps. The same device, the fish trap, was long since abolished in the other Pacific salmon areas—British Columbia, Washington and Oregon, where the people, and not a distant Federal Bureau had control over their resources. In those areas, while the same resource was originally far less bountiful, it has been conserved. In session after session our territorial legislators have memorialized Congress to abolish fish traps. In session after session of the Congress, our voteless delegate in the House would introduce a bill to abolish fish traps. The people of Alaska, on a referendum 11 years ago, voted by a ratio of over 7 to 1 for the abolition of fish traps, but all in vain.

The result has been the tragic depletion of the fisheries, from a pack of approximately 8½ million cases a quarter of a century ago to less than 3 million cases last year. So grave was the effect of this depletion in Alaska that in 1953 President Eisenhower was obliged to declare Alaska's fishing communities to be disaster areas. Federal funds had to be spent to assist them. This is the first time in my experience that a disaster area was caused, not by so-called acts of God—hurricane, flood, tornado, earthquake, famine—but by acts of men.

Since then the situation has worsened. Alaska now has many depressed areas. Practically every fishing village in Alaska is a depressed area, and we therefore hope for the early passage of the proposed legislation which will help to relieve that situation.

This, Mr. President, is a prime example of how our natural resources can be depleted by selfish interests with their eyes only on immediate profits and entirely forgetful of the fact that our

natural resources should be preserved and protected in the interests of and as a heritage for the future generations. It is also an example of how a Federal regulatory agency, whose prime responsibility is conservation, can abdicate that function and permit itself in fact to be regulated by the industry it is supposed to regulate. Despite the mounting evidence of depletion, despite the pleas of Alaskans, the Agency arbitrarily accepted the industry's position on fish-traps.

Why, Mr. President, has such a great natural resource as the Alaska salmon been permitted to be depleted? The answer lies in greed and lack of foresight.

The greed was manifest in the hard fight waged by the fishing interests to continue to use fish traps in Alaska—even though the use of such wasteful fishing methods were banned in the very States—Oregon and Washington—from which many of these selfsame fishing companies hailed.

The lack of foresight, Mr. President, was manifest in the reluctance to invest in the future—a reluctance to appropriate sufficient funds to safeguard this great resource. Unfortunately, we are witnessing today a continuance of that same lack of foresight in many other areas where there is great resistance to appropriating funds with which to develop, to preserve, and to protect some of the great natural resources of our country.

In what has happened to the Alaska fishing industry we see a portent of things to come in other areas if we continue to lack the vision needed.

Mr. President, we shall shortly be debating the area redevelopment bill. It is my hope that it will be speedily passed. I am hopeful that it will prove helpful in assisting some of the Alaska fishing areas in their rehabilitation, as well as other depressed areas in the 49 States. But the need for such assistance in these areas should point up the moral. Such assistance would not have been necessary if, during the half century preceding this era, those responsible had taken the necessary steps to prevent the depletion of the salmon resources of Alaska.

The action by the Secretary of the Interior in banning the general use of fishtraps—however late—is welcome. It comes some 10 days after the first State Legislature of Alaska took similar action.

Meanwhile, Alaskans will now begin the long task of rebuilding from the bottom the once great salmon fishery resource. I am confident that now—having control of this resource, cherishing it, living close to it, understanding its importance—they will eventually succeed.

DISCONTINUANCE OF COMMUTER TRAINS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I joined this week with several other Senators in cosponsoring legislation that would prohibit the discontinuance of commuter trains until there has been a formal judgment by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a judgment based on the public interest and the needs of commuters, as well as the overall welfare of the railroad involved.

This bill would amend the Transportation Act of 1958, which now permits railroads to automatically discontinue passenger trains if they are not formally forbidden to do so by the Interstate Commerce Commission within 5 months after the application for discontinuance.

Since the passage of this act, more than 27 notices have been filed for the discontinuance of more than 100 passenger trains. Five months has proved an inadequate time for the Interstate Commerce Commission to properly investigate and make findings upon this flood of discontinuance requests.

Each of these requests poses a complex problem for the Interstate Commerce Commission, the solution of which must be based upon a delicate balance between the needs of the railroad, the needs of the public, and the overriding transportation needs of the Nation. The result of this insufficient time for proper study is that passenger trains may be discontinued by default, without public hearings and without a careful determination by proper authorities. Thus, the purpose of the Transportation Act of 1958 is not being fulfilled.

I greatly sympathize with the problems of the railroad industry and I intend to do everything I can, commensurate with the public interest, to solve those problems.

The desire of railroads to discontinue unprofitable lines is understandable.

However, a railroad is different from an ordinary private enterprise. It is granted an exclusive and valuable franchise by government and it, therefore, has a special obligation to meet the needs of the area it serves. Some of these necessary services may prove unprofitable, but railroads must be prepared to meet those public needs which involve loss as well as those which involve profit.

Under the bill I am cosponsoring, one of the criterions which the ICC must consider is the overall condition of the railroad, based on its total profit and loss situation in a given area. This is meant to protect railroads from having to continue passenger trains at a loss they cannot afford.

I recognize that the declining status of our Nation's railroads poses serious problems which deserve the immediate attention of Congress. I am prepared to join in measures to rescue the railroads from their present difficulties. But I am just as anxious that the people receive the necessary services they are entitled to, and I believe that the proposed legislation will result in a fairer consideration of the needs of the public.

NECESSITY FOR NEW TAXES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday I read from the Whaley-Eaton News Service letter and failed to give it credit for the information which appears on page 3159 of the RECORD. I apologize for that oversight.

INFLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee has been

holding hearings for sometime to try to discover why we have inflation.

On the one hand, some witnesses say that our inflation has been due to greater demand than supply.

Other witnesses have asserted that the inflation since the war has resulted from decisions by labor leaders and business leaders to raise prices. The testimony is further that these price-rise decisions have occurred in industries where they have so-called administered prices. Administered prices seem to be prices which can be raised or lowered by decisions of business or labor leaders and which last for a certain length of time without being affected by the market.

If this is so, it means that consumers are so anxious to buy the products of these industries and the industries are so strong, that the labor leaders and the business leaders in the industry have a wide discretion as to what price they shall establish for their product.

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING SESSIONS

Naturally, the price of the product depends a lot on the cost of the labor that goes into the product.

In these big industries, the cost of the labor is agreed upon periodically in collective-bargaining sessions between management leaders and labor leaders.

There is representation of the management side, and of the labor side, at these meetings. The agreed wage increases—which will result in price increases—adversely affect the consuming public. But the consumer is not represented at these wage bargaining sessions.

I should like to raise the question whether there is some way in which the consumer can be represented in collective bargaining sessions.

CONSUMER REPRESENTATION?

Could the Government—without any thought of Government dictatorship—be authorized and directed by the Congress to have a consumer representative of great ability and wisdom present at collective bargaining sessions? His job could be to let the public in on what is going on during collective bargaining, and to express without power to decide what the consumer's interest appears to be.

Perhaps, in this way, the consumers could throw a little light into the collective bargaining sessions.

As things have gone, it appears that collective bargaining sessions have a big part to play in the inflationary spiral. Wages are raised and prices are raised and, though it may be argued which one comes first, that is like the argument of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. But the result is that we have both, the chicken and the egg, and that we also—over the years—have inflation.

Here is something to cause one to think twice—a list of pending bills which if enacted, would cost \$190 odd billions. I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED COST OF REVENUE LOSS IF SELECTED BILLS WERE ENACTED

1. S. 722, Douglas and others: Area Redevelopment Act, \$400 million.

2. H.R. 2357, Rains: Housing Act (as reported by committee), \$1.6 billion through 1963, \$6.1 billion in total cost, including \$3.7 billion for public housing over 40 years.

3. S. 2, Murray: School Support Act, \$15 to \$16.2 billion for 5 years.

4. H.R. 22, Metcalf; 5. S. 1087, Humphrey: Student Aid Act, \$966 million for 5 years.

6. H.R. 1031, Multer: Emergency program of grants for public works, \$2.5 billion appropriation authorization.

7. H.R. 1030, Multer: Community facilities and public works, \$2.5 billion public-debt authorization.

8. H.R. 77, Patman: Old-age pensions for all over 65, \$66 billion for 5 years.

9. S. 791, Kennedy: Unemployment reinsurance grants, \$1 to \$2 billion for 5 years.

10. H.R. 102, Hogan: Pensions for World War I veterans, \$9 to \$10 billion for 5 years.

11. H.R. 208, Morrison: Federal employees' health insurance, \$1.2 billion for 5 years.

12. H.R. 370, Abernethy: Increase individual income-tax exemption to \$1,000, \$50 billion revenue loss in 5 years.

13. S. 881, Morse: Social security health insurance, \$6.1 billion for 5 years.

14. S. 1, Monroney: Airports grants, \$565 million for 5 years.

15. H.R. 1301, McGovern: Farm income, \$66.5 billion for 5 years.

Total, \$193.3 to \$196.5 billion.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 2260.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-10-59-B" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President within sixty days after the effective date of this Act. Seven members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and confirmed by the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed as Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my statement in support of the amendment will be very brief. I should like to have the

attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for a moment.

It is my understanding from our colloquy last night that the Senator from South Dakota has no particular or strong feeling one way or the other regarding my amendment, or objection to it. He has modified his own original proposal which provided for four civilian and three military personnel. The Senator from South Dakota has modified his proposal so as to include six civilian and one military personnel.

As our debate last night shows, I have deep convictions about not having any persons who are on active military duty in any policymaking position involving the military. The place for them, in my judgment, is at the witness table. They should be called upon for advice, information, and testimony, but they should not be given a vote in determining questions of policy which involve, in a very real sense, in the ultimate, at least, the legislative processes of Congress. It is one thing to have a civilian commission which can make a study and submit its advice and recommendations to Congress; but I think it is quite a different thing to put a military man on active duty in a policymaking position. That is the reason for my amendment.

I shall certainly understand whatever position the Senator from South Dakota takes on my proposal, because of my high respect for him; but it may be that the Senator from South Dakota will be willing to accept my amendment. Then we could have one vote on the Commission as a complete civilian commission.

I ask the Senator from South Dakota if his point of view is such that he would find it impossible to accept my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, generally speaking, I respect the argument which the able Senator from Oregon has made with respect to having policy decisions made independently of the agency which would be expected to carry out any given policy. Of course, the Commission does not have the final determination in the matter. The final determination would rest in the hands of Congress. The Commission would make a report to the President.

But because I respect the argument, I did ask unanimous consent last night, which was given, to modify the amendment so as to provide for Commission personnel of six civilians and one member of the military. On the other hand, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to making the membership of the Commission exclusively civilian, and if my acceptance of the proposal of the Senator from Oregon would settle the issue, I should be glad to accept it.

I point out, in that connection, that the Commission will have the authority, under the language of the amendment, to get whatever information from the department it desires.

I call attention to paragraph (g) on page 3 of the printed amendment, which reads as follows:

The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any department—

And, of course, that would include the Department of Defense—

agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matters for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or independent establishment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman of the Commission.

In view of that language, which is a part of the amendment, I see no necessity for having even one member of the Commission selected from the Department of Defense. It would be satisfactory to me to have the entire Commission a civilian commission, reporting to the President, who in turn would communicate to Congress whatever recommendations the Commission might make. Congress then would have the final decision in its hands.

Therefore, to the extent that my assent is necessary, I am willing to accept the amendment. I recognize that the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment, and that it can be modified only by consent. But if the Senators who are present will accept my desire in the matter, I shall be happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think all the Senator from South Dakota has to do is to ask unanimous consent that his amendment be modified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified by striking paragraph (b) and substituting the paragraph designated (b) in the form of an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, and that my amendment as modified then be substituted for paragraph (b) in the original text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I think we have greatly expedited action on the matter. I think there will be a much stronger Commission personnel arrangement now, with all of the members being civilians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as modified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, apropos the discussion of a Commission, the Commission having been whittled down from one which would have been half military and half civilian to the point where it is now proposed that it shall be all civilian, it appears to me that one of the ways we have of avoiding issues is the creation of commissions. The President is very good at the appointment of commissions.

I wish some day there would be undertaken an investigation or survey to ascertain what has happened to all the commissions which have been appointed during the past 6 years—how many of

them have made reports; how many of them have been appointed, and have died either a natural or an unnatural death; how many of them are hidden behind cobwebs in the various departments of the Government.

It is my understanding—although I may be mistaken, and I should like to ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if my understanding is correct—that the pending amendment relates to a matter which the chairman of the committee believes should be a congressional function; and that to that end he has indicated that it is his intention to appoint a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, so that in that way a congressional committee or commission, so to speak, will look into this particular subject matter, will make a report, and in that way perhaps will be able to furnish valuable guidance, not only to the Armed Services Committee, but also to the Senate as a whole and to the Congress as a whole. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment was proposed originally in the Armed Services Committee, when we were marking up this bill. The amendment was discussed very thoroughly.

In the committee there was considerable objection to the amendment, for some of the reasons the Senator has indicated.

Many commissions have made recommendations in the military field. We have had the so-called Cordier Committee, headed by a leader of business. It studied at some length the military manpower situation, and rendered a voluminous report.

For several years after 1951, we had the National Security Training Commission, established by the Congress to make recommendations relating to military training and such other recommendations relating to manpower as it considered desirable.

The former distinguished Senator from New York, James Wadsworth, who is recognized as an authority in this field, partly because of his service as Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, when he was a member of this body—was chairman of that group. He was succeeded by General Sarnoff, who, as I recall, has been president and chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. General Sarnoff has had a great deal of experience. They gave careful and earnest consideration to the means of providing the necessary military manpower.

In addition, there was the Rockefeller report. This was based on a study financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

This study resulted in a comprehensive report, which is available to the members of the committee, and, as a matter of fact, has been very helpful to the Congress, I am frank to state.

But, Mr. President, it has seemed to me, and it has appeared to the committee, that the subject matter of the pending amendment is within the responsi-

bility of Congress, and that Congress cannot dodge or eliminate that responsibility by creating an outside Commission. When the bill was under committee consideration, I stated to the committee that it was my purpose at an early date to appoint a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee to conduct continuing studies into the utilization of military manpower.

After all, it is the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to provide for the strength of the Armed Forces; and although we are glad to obtain advice from every source, we have not been able to assimilate the reports of all the previous Commissions. As a matter of fact, I have not named all of them; there have been others. But I have mentioned the more outstanding ones and the more recent ones that have studied the problems which the proposed group would be created to consider.

I doubt very seriously whether the appointment of another Commission would serve any useful purpose. I believe that, instead, it would be likely to confuse the issue.

We are now considering questions about the necessary military strength of the country and the wisdom of demobilizing some of our present forces. Congress has taken one view of that matter; the executive branch of the Government has taken another.

But now it is proposed that the Congress, which has taken one position on that matter, authorize the executive branch to appoint a Commission with congressional sanction; and it would be a Commission with the executive would name. It is highly unlikely that the executive branch would name a Commission that would support the Congress and would fail to support the executive branch which would name the members of the Commission.

So I do not think anything would be gained by having such a Commission appointed now. In fact, I think the appointment of such a Commission at this time would only add confusion.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has answered my question. He has stated that it is his intention—not one arrived at lately, but one he has already brought before the members of his committee—to establish a subcommittee on manpower requirements, and so forth, and to have the subcommittee look into this particular matter.

Let me ask this question: If the President wishes to appoint a commission to look into this matter, he can do so at any time, without congressional sanction or request, can he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The proof of that is that he has already appointed commissions in this field. I believe they are called committees, when he appoints them; but they are either committees or commissions, composed of groups of men whom the President has selected to conduct studies for the benefit of other branches of the Government. There is nothing on earth to prevent the President from appointing any number

of commissions that he may wish to appoint in this area. To be frank, I would not be surprised if he did appoint one to consider such problems, which have been before us for many years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me ask the Senator whether he is about to speak on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, before the vote on the amendment is taken. Therefore, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Bartlett	Green	Moss
Beall	Gruening	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Murray
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Bridges	Hayden	Neuberger
Bush	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Cannon	Humphrey	Randolph
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Javits	Russell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Scott
Chavez	Keating	Smathers
Church	Kefauver	Smith
Clark	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lausche	Talmadge
Dodd	Long	Thurmond
Douglas	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McGee	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McNamara	Yarborough
Engle	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Frear	Monroney	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to create a Commission on Military Manpower, to be composed of 7 members to be nominated by the President and to be confirmed by the Senate.

The bill before the Senate proposed to extend the draft, or the so-called Universal Military Training and Service Act, for 4 years without substantive amendment. The bill would only change the dates in the present law, for all intents

and purposes. In fact, that is all it would do, except for the new section 5, which is not related to the substance of the operation of the act.

The testimony before the committee clearly indicated that today there are inequities and discriminations in the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act today. The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL] is commenting upon the testimony presented by Major General Harrison of the National Guard, said—and I quote again the statement I quoted yesterday—

So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation.

The Director of the Selective Service System, General Hershey, himself said:

Millions of our young men have been told they have little, if anything, to contribute to their Nation's defense—because of physical or mental conditions.

He said further:

We are not doing all we should do in preparation against possible nuclear attack. * * *

Much needs to be done, but many are doing nothing. We cannot afford to waste our manpower.

One of the newspapers which I quoted yesterday said:

Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need—

That is, the extension of the act—

It ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Time magazine said:

The most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable.

Yet, despite all that testimony and those conclusions, if we should pass the bill as it comes before us, without providing at least for a study by an objective civilian commission, we would be doing nothing to modify the present inequities, discrimination, waste of manpower, and whatever other evils there may be in the operation of the present System.

The amendment which I have offered was discussed in the committee. There was some sentiment for it in the committee. However, it was not brought to a vote in committee. But after considering the testimony which was given and the reports which were made by representatives of youth organizations before the committee, I felt that the Senate ought to have an opportunity to pass upon this question.

The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] raised the question about having an additional commission. I remind Senators that we have had commissions which have had fruitful results, including the Hoover Commission, which made recommenda-

tions for various reforms in Government; the Clay Commission, which made the primary report upon the basis of which the highway bill was developed, and the Cordiner Commission, which submitted a report, which led to reforms in the pay and other features of the services.

The distinguished Senator from Montana is one of the sponsors of a movement to investigate the water resources of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to point out that the resolution to which the Senator refers calls for the creation of a senatorial commission, whose members would not be appointed or designated by the President of the United States. I believe that we have a responsibility in the water resource field. As the Senator from South Dakota well knows, the water problems of this country are of great importance; and the time is not too far distant when water will become more important than oil.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that water is an important resource. But I will not debate with him or anyone else the relative merits of the water resources of the country and the young men of the country. We are taking young men between the ages of 19 and 35, in the most formative period of their lives, and subjecting them to the direction and planning of the state, the Government. They deserve an opportunity to have a civilian commission make its recommendations with respect to the regulations and the directives under which we place them.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it quite clear from the Senator's amendment that the Commission will be a civilian Commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is. Earlier in the day I agreed to the change proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], which would make the Commission entirely civilian. Last night I proposed to make it a 6-to-1 civilian Commission. Today, upon the request of the Senator from Oregon, I agreed to make it a wholly civilian Commission, whose members would be nominated by the President, and whose nominations would be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it quite clear from the Senator's amendment that there is a time limitation for the filing of a report by the Commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language of the amendment is as follows:

(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

The bill pending before the Senate would extend the draft for 4 years. My

amendment would insure a report within 2 years.

Mr. CARROLL. Within a 2-year period?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Within a 2-year period.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I am in complete agreement with him. There is no reason why the Military Establishment should not be examined from time to time by a group of civilians, especially in view of the fact that the draft has been in effect for almost 19 years, except for a brief recess of 17 months in 1947-48. There could be no harm in taking a look at the situation. The committees of Congress, which have the primary jurisdiction, would make recommendations. We would still have all the other checks and safeguards. In my opinion no harm could come from the proposed study. At least it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is about the minimum which we ought to do if we believe that the civilian viewpoint should have full and free consideration with respect to the use of the manpower of the United States.

It is true that we also had testimony from Mr. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, who wanted us to make better use of the scientific and technological manpower in the country. He pointed out that we still are not meeting the need for engineering and scientific talent. Many members of the committee said we ought to do something about it, but we would be doing nothing about it if we were merely to extend the draft law as it is today. The pressure would be off. Anyone with legislative experience knows that once the draft was extended the pressure would be off—the pressure for review, examination, modification, and improvement.

It is true that we had the National Security Training Commission, to which the distinguished chairman has referred. It is true that we had the Cordiner report. Both of those were pre-Sputnik. We have not had any military manpower commission studying the problem, either generally or specifically, or from the civilian standpoint, since Sputnik was launched.

I believe that every Member of the Senate, if he were to consult the people of his State on this question, would vote for this amendment. But there has been no real opportunity for the people of the country to realize that this measure was coming to a vote so soon. There were 3 days of hearings last week. At that time some witnesses testified that they thought there should be longer hearings, and more notice. We marked up the bill in committee on Monday of this week. It was brought to the floor of the Senate on Tuesday. Had it not been for the debate last night, it would have been voted upon last night.

Let us give the people of the country, through civilians nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, an opportunity to express themselves, so that in the years ahead we may make the very best possible use of our most precious resource.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two questions which interest me: I am inclined to support the Senator's amendment, but I feel that those two questions should be determined. I notice in paragraph 3, on page 3, in that portion of the amendment dealing with the functions of the proposed commission, the following:

Alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

Those, like myself, who are deeply interested in a strong posture on the part of the United States to support its policy want to know whether that language implies any irresolution on our part in our determination to ask our young men to do the job which must be done to support our struggle for peace.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should say certainly not. This amendment would be merely an addendum to the bill. Without it we would be merely extending the draft for 4 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator whether he envisages the possibility that the commission might submit a report which might affect our foreign policy, in terms of lessening the number of men mobilized, or whether we might be asked to make some other fundamental decision which might weaken our powers in the military field, merely because the commission might not agree with what we were doing in terms of foreign policy?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not have a weakening effect. It might result in some better use of manpower. Testimony by Under Secretary of the Army Finucane and other representatives of the Department of Defense was to the effect that if we could find some way to extend the time men remain in the service, we would have a stronger force, rather than a weaker force. Mr. Cordiner, in his report, took somewhat the same view. He stated that 25 percent of our effort is devoted to the training of manpower, and he indicated that there was waste in that field, and that we should not have to use 25 percent of our effort in that activity.

I hope recommendations will be made which will enable us to find ways and means of improving the strength of the military forces and thus make them more effective and more efficient.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator therefore say, as the sponsor of the amendment, as perfected by the Senator from Oregon, that he wishes legislative history established which will guide the commission, as reflected by the two answers which he has just made to me, as to what we had in mind, if the amendment were adopted?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very definitely. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has asked the questions.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Last night I heard the interesting speech of the Senator from South Dakota and also the eloquent

speech of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I repeat what I said last evening. First, I believe both Senators have performed a service to the Senate and to the country in insisting that there shall be a full development and discussion of the draft question in the Senate. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft for the period recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. I remember that in 1948, when this question was before the Senate, I voted to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to limit the draft to 2 years. I believe that the gravity of the situation today has brought about a different condition. For that reason I intend to support the committee in that respect.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the able Senator from South Dakota, for many reasons. Chiefly I do so for this reason: Whether we say it is so or not, it is a practical fact that we have a permanent draft. The draft has become almost a permanent institution in our country. Circumstances may dictate that we continue the draft period from year to year. Undoubtedly present circumstances do dictate such a decision. I still maintain my own view, however, that the draft is not an institution of American life and that it is not in harmony with the traditions of American life as a permanent institution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For peacetime.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota goes to that point, and that there will be an opportunity for a continued investigation and study and determination of the basic question of whether we actually intend to make the draft a permanent institution in our national life.

Secondly, if we are to do so, there should be made a careful and thoughtful study, by able men who have the time to go into such a study, as to the way in which it can be a most effective instrument for the security of our Nation.

I believe there is an inequality of sacrifice by the young men of this country. Some of our young men are called into service, others go into it voluntarily. There are those who do not give any kind of service. It is this kind of question which the investigation will go into and which will be covered by the report. I intend to vote for the amendment. I am happy the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Oregon have provoked this discussion and have offered an amendment which gives us an opportunity to go to the roots of these basic questions.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is there anything in the amendment which the Senator has offered to indicate that this would be a bipartisan or nonpartisan Commission? I notice that in subparagraph (b) the Commission is described, but it does not mention that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. It has not been customary in the Committee

on Armed Services to raise partisan questions.

Mr. BUSH. This is to be a public Commission, as I understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. I assume that in the tradition of the country in dealing with matters of this kind of Commission would be nonpartisan. I would say nonpartisan, rather than bipartisan. The Senate has the power of confirmation, and the Senate has a strong Democratic majority. The President is a Republican. He would name the members of the Commission, within 60 days of the effective date of the act. He would have to submit the names of the members of the Commission. They would be considered by a Senate which is 2-to-1 Democratic. That fact alone would seem to indicate that the persons named would be selected. I should hope, on the basis of their ability to analyze our manpower resources and make recommendations for the use of those resources.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator would not modify his amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not want to do it.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have listened to the speech of the Senator from South Dakota. What is his opposition to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, to name a subcommittee to go into the matter? It seems to me that a subcommittee composed of Senators can handle the matter very well. Why should we establish another commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The answer to that question is this. Eventually the recommendations would come to a subcommittee for consideration. However I have observed that when Senators are assigned to a committee they tend to develop a certain vested interest in the viewpoint of the department with which the committee deals. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I cast no aspersions on that committee—naturally tends to assimilate the information of the Department of Agriculture. The Committee on Armed Services naturally inclines to the viewpoint expressed by the Department of Defense.

I prefer a commission to which the people, the rank and file of them, could feel they could go and, in an uninhibited way, express their ideas and recommendations from a civilian point of view. That is why I acceded to the suggestion that it be an entirely civilian commission. In the final analysis the answers are going to come from Congress, and Congress will make the decision. However, I should like to have the people, for whom the Senator from North Dakota has on so many occasions so eloquently spoken and whose petitions and letters he has submitted, be permitted to express themselves, and that these expressions of the public mind, which the Senator from North Dakota so frequently brings to our attention, should come into play in con-

nection with the problems related to the effective nondiscriminatory use of our young men.

Mr. LANGER. The people go to the Senators and other Members of Congress. The people go to the Senators whom they have elected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They do, and would in this instance eventually.

Mr. LANGER. I am opposed to establishing commissions and bureaus. It seems to me that we should put an end to it at some time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the time when Congress is in session it is difficult for a subcommittee to devote time to this subject, as is evidenced by the fact that the bill has come to us without the benefit of any exploration into possible changes in the law.

In a review of the bill when it passed the House, one of the local newspapers reported:

There was some support within the Pentagon before its submission to Congress for changes in the draft law because the manpower pool is steadily mounting, but administration chiefs and congressional leaders decided a simple extension of the law was preferable to opening up the complex law to legislative changes that might prove more troublesome than present defects.

That is the attitude which is reflected. That is why today 10 million young men are registered under the draft, but less than half of them will ever see military services. Does anyone believe that the burden is equitably distributed? Anyone who considers the facts must come to the conclusion that it is not.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the amendment. I recognize that at this time the legislative machinery is such as to make difficult the adoption of an amendment of this sort. But I believe that if every Senator were to consult the people of his State, he would learn that they would like to have this kind of review of our manpower resources.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of some of the statements made by the Senator from South Dakota, I feel that it is incumbent upon me, representing the Committee on Armed Services, to make a brief reply.

The Senator from South Dakota has complained about the expeditious handling of the bill in the Senate. It is very difficult to please all Members of the Senate in the handling of legislation. Some Senators think the handling of a bill is too fast; others think it is not handled rapidly enough. The fact remains that this bill was introduced early in the year and has been before the committee ever since early February. The further fact is that the Committee on Armed Services afforded every witness who requested to be heard an opportunity to testify.

I do not know what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota expected the committee to do. Did he think the committee ought to have closed the hearings and advertised for people to come forth and present their views?

The Senator from South Dakota has quoted, on at least two occasions, a statement made by me. I stand firmly on that statement today. There are marked inequities and inequalities in the degree of military service rendered by young men in the defense of our country. Most of it exists in the Reserve service. There are more than 30 different ways in which a man can discharge his military obligation to his country. The chief injustices are the result of regulations which are made in the executive branch of the Government.

The principal inequity I have in mind is that those who are inducted, after they have completed their 24 months of service, are divided. About half of them are placed in Active Reserve units, where they must serve for 2 years and attend 48 drills and take 2 weeks of training a year; the other half are placed in a Reserve pool, where they have to take only 15 days of training over a 3-year period. That is an inequity and an injustice. But Congress did not create it; it was created in the executive branch of the Government.

There is another inequity or injustice in the military which I had in mind. In 1955 the Committee on Armed Services was urged that it was necessary for the Nation to have a greatly enlarged Reserve program. The committee reported a bill. Congress passed it. The bill provided that a young man could submit himself for 6 months of active duty for training, and after he had had the 6 months of training he could serve 7½ years in the Reserve and thereby discharge his obligation. This proved to be a tremendously attractive program to the young men of the country. But as soon as the men started to appear in any considerable number the Department of Defense severely curtailed the program and said they could not operate it to its full potential. That is not the fault of Congress; it is due to the action of the executive branch of the Government.

These inequities will not be cured by our authorizing the executive branch to appoint a commission to deal with them.

When I was a young student in law school, old Dr. Morris—peace to his memory—had a saying that a jury would never convict a man for stealing a steer if the jury had eaten the beef at a barbecue. Inequities in the executive branch will not be corrected by giving the President the power to appoint a commission to deal with them.

There has been no dearth of commissions. We have had the Cordiner Commission. Mr. Cordiner, I believe, was the head of the General Electric Co. He and his associates studied methods of attracting a voluntary career force and the subject of manpower week after week and made extensive recommendations. Congress enacted legislation based on them.

We had the National Security Training Commission, as I said a few minutes ago, first presided over by former Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and more recently by General Sarnoff, of New York, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. They submitted reports.

There have been two Rockefeller Commissions, one appointed by the President. After the first commission had reported on Defense reorganization, the Rockefeller Foundation financed a private study into defense matters. There have been many other commissions.

This problem will not be solved and Congress will not escape its responsibility by authorizing another commission to be appointed by the President. We know the basic facts in this case. We have all kinds of tables and charts. We know the number of young men who are in this age group and that age group. We know the number who have gone to college and how many have gone to high school. We know how many have availed themselves of each of the 30 methods for discharging their responsibility in the military service of the country.

It would be most unusual for us to create a commission at this particular time. Unfortunately, there have been different opinions between the majority of Congress and the executive branch of the Government on the extent of military strength necessary in this time of world crisis.

Congress has a responsibility. It will not escape it by giving to the executive department the power to appoint a commission to review the matter. Is the President likely to appoint a commission which will support the view of Congress and will be somewhat critical of his position? Or will it not be more likely to sustain the views of the President?

When the Committee on Armed Services was considering the bill, I stated that Congress could not avoid its responsibility. I said I proposed to create or appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a continuing study of the utilization of the military manpower of the Nation. Congress has a responsibility. We cannot avoid it by appointing commissions. It is about time that we got away from attempting to meet every problem by the appointment of a commission. Some day we may be overtaken by the problems.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say that he plans to appoint a subcommittee to study this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated in the committee when the committee was considering the bill. It is not a new proposal. It is not in answer to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LONG. The thought occurs to me that some of the civilian experts who have been asked to study the problem have oftentimes been so busy with their own affairs that they do not have the time which is necessary to do real justice to the work, and that the persons who are hired on the staff sometimes end by being the ones who dominate the entire investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The persons appointed are usually those who have achieved success in the field of finance, but they do not have outstanding ability or experience in the military field. They

do not have the time to make the proper study. Their names are more in the nature of symbols. Usually we end by getting practically the same recommendations from the commission that we have had from the Department of Defense on the same subject. It is merely a new way of asking for the views of the Department of Defense. It might not do any great harm, but why should we try to avoid our responsibility by appointing an outside commission?

Mr. President, I have been asked to remind the Senate—and I am prepared to do so—that at 12:15 we are expected to go to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend a joint meeting and to hear the President of one of our neighboring republics, the Republic of El Salvador.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bartlett	Frear	Morton
Capehart	Gruening	Mundt
Carroll	Hart	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Prouty
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Schoeppel
Cooper	McNamara	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—68

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Green	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Murray
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Carlson	Jordan	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Chavez	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Dodd	Lausche	Talmadge
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ervin	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson Gore Kerr
Curtis Hennings Martin

So. Mr. CASE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On yesterday, as I recall, the Senate ordered that a recess be declared today at 12:15 p.m., subject to the call of the Chair, because of a joint meeting which will immediately begin in the other body. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to proceed with his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up, for consideration immediately after the conclusion of the joint meeting, my amendment identified as 3-10-59-C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1961."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while so many Senators are present, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon have any idea how long he desires to discuss his amendment? Can he advise me of the approximate time so I may inform Senators?

Mr. MORSE. Not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to announce for the information of all Senators that as soon as the joint meeting is concluded, the Senate will immediately reconvene, and the pending question will be the Morse amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an understanding, in order to expedite the consideration of the pending legislation, that immediately after the joint meeting I may be recognized to present my argument on the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the Senate's reconvening the Senator from Oregon be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the Senate then proceed to vote on the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF EL SALVADOR—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that pursuant to the order entered yesterday the Senate now stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order of yesterday, for the purpose of proceeding to the Hall of the House to hear an address to be delivered before the two Houses by the President of El Salvador, the Chair declares the Senate in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m., the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the address to be delivered by the Honorable Jose Maria Lemus, President of El Salvador.

(For the address delivered by the President of El Salvador, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that under a previous agreement the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have 15 minutes on his amendment, which is now pending, and that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will have not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Oregon prepared to proceed, or would he like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I am prepared to proceed.

Mr. President, in the 3 days of hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I find testimony in opposition to continuation of the draft from many private witnesses, most of them representing churches and religious groups, educational interests, and organizations of young people.

In support of a 4-year extension, I find testimony from the Defense Department Chiefs and members of the armed services.

But where are the recommendations from the expert study groups that have been used by the President to study preparedness? What has become of the Cordiner report and the Gaither report, for example? The Gaither report has not been made public, but enough of it is known for us to say that it found

America's military security in an inadequate and perhaps even precarious state.

The basic finding of the Cordiner group was that—

The modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able to present, and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force.

It was because of this report that Congress upped the pay schedules of the armed services, though many of us had misgivings at the time that we might be promoting career service in the upper grades but the tiny boost in pay for the lowest grades would do precious little to encourage the men in them to make a career of military service.

The Cordiner report continued:

The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try-hard enough to take on higher responsibilities.

The Cordiner report dealt primarily with compensation as a means of retaining qualified men in the armed services. But it assumed the necessity for a strong career service.

For example, on page 43, we find the following:

The day has passed when a large portion of the military work force performed relatively unskilled tasks and a major measure of their competence was based upon discipline and physical fitness only. Today, a large portion of the defense team must possess not only the discipline and physical and mental stamina formerly required, but also a trained, experienced, and disciplined skill in the use of complex equipment.

Development of this level of skill requires adequate quality input to training, an intensive program of instruction, and supervised on-the-job experience before the full effectiveness of the individual and equipment in his charge can be realized.

And on page 44:

Such retention is not being realized today to an acceptable, economic degree. It is least realized in the skills requiring the most lengthy and costly training. Today there is a tremendous outflow of effort to train a stream of transient personnel to a journeyman level of competence without a reasonable realization of skilled service in return. This is the heart of the enlisted retention problem.

Elsewhere in the Cordiner report we find statements that modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialists in 2 years, and we find a summary of Cordiner's reactions from talking to many draftees. I quote him again:

I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They (the men) were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who do not stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks.

This is supposed to be a report of manpower experts. Why has it not been

taken into account? Does the President believe its findings and recommendations are unwarranted, except those recommendations for higher pay for the top brass which he urged Congress to adopt?

If the Cordiner report is not sound in its findings on the use and value of draftees, why has not the President and the Pentagon answered those findings and disproved them?

Figures put into the Senate Committee hearing record by the Defense Department show that reenlistments on the part of all regulars in all the services ran from 43.5 percent to 50.8 percent between 1956 and 1958. Reenlistment by Army regulars was just about the same on the average, as for the entire Defense establishment.

But reenlistment by draftees, all of whom are in the Army, ran from 2.2 percent to a high of 4.7 percent.

I am simply at a loss to understand why a 4-year extension of the draft is being advertised as necessary to safeguard American security and to frighten the Russian. In my opinion, it will do neither. I am satisfied that the Russians know that the draft does not strengthen America's security.

What is needed is a congressional re-study of manpower needs. Of course, that job has already been done by executive commissions, but their findings and recommendations either remain locked away or are ignored by the administration that hired them done.

A 2-year extension of the draft while Congress reexamines the military manpower situation is essential for the security of the country. Voting for a 4-year extension of an inadequate system would be to vote for a label.

I want genuine security for my country, and not merely an illusion of security.

Senators know, and the record of the last 12 years amply bears me out, that I have been an advocate of universal military training. With genuine, uniform, and universal basic military training for every American man in early manhood we would have the manpower of basically trained men the Nation would need in time of war.

But I am for a universal military training program which bears a direct relation to the skills, the knowledge, and the competency of each individual. The draft as we now have it bears no such relationship.

We have never had real universal military training. We have never really put it into effect. If we did have it, and in addition had a highly trained career armed force for continuous protection, I think our country would be far more secure than it is today.

Instead, we have compromised with a continuation of selective service, a type of manpower selection that all the experts tell us is inadequate. We have neither the tremendous reservoir that universal military training would provide, nor the career, professional force that is vital over the long run when we are faced with the kind of perpetual and continuing menace of Communist pressure.

I simply do not want to delay for 4 years a reexamination of these inade-

quate military manpower practices. We should limit the present system to 2 years, and have a congressional study come back at the end of those 2 years with its proposals. If we did that, then I think the Kremlin would know we mean business. What the Russians will learn from a simple 4-year extension will be that the United States is satisfied with its present defense arrangement and does not plan to correct or change the inadequacies that everyone knows are in it, for at least 4 years.

In 1948, in the debate on the draft issue, when it was recommended by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate that the draft be for a 5-year period, I proposed an amendment calling for a limitation to 2 years. As will be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that year, an excerpt from which was placed in the RECORD yesterday, my amendment was agreed to by a vote of 47 to 33.

I ask, What has happened since 1948 which would justify a longer extension than 2 years? In 1948 we voted for a 2-year extension. It was increased to 4 years at the time of the Korean war. The record which the Armed Services Committee has brought to our desks leaves no room for doubt in my mind—and I believe in the mind of anyone who will study the record—that a 4-year extension is not justified by the facts on the record. It is not justified by the expert studies on military manpower which have already been made and reports on which have been submitted. There is no doubt in my mind that this extension is being asked for by the Pentagon in order to entrench even deeper some malpractices and inefficiencies in the use of American manpower. What we must say to the Pentagon is: "We will give you 2 years more, and only 2 years more, of this inefficient draft system which you are operating, and at the end of 2 years we will bring forth a bill based upon the facts as to what the Nation needs, and we will adopt a manpower policy based upon the studies which will have been made."

The Senate will make a grievous mistake today if it extends for 4 years a draft system which is honeycombed with great weaknesses and inefficiencies, and is characterized by practices which do not strengthen the security of our country but which, in my judgment, weaken it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we all know that if we extend the Draft Act for 4 years, the danger will be that Congress will forget about the problem until the 4 years have passed. The people of the United States, the voters whom we represent, are entitled to action by the Senate today. They are entitled to action which carries out the pledge that automatically at the end of 2 years we will take another look at the draft law.

I urge the adoption of my amendment. My amendment will give to the draft system all the service from Congress to which it is entitled. My amendment will permit what I regard as an outdated, inefficient military manpower system to proceed for another 2 years, until we can adopt a perfected one 2 years hence.

Consideration of the extension of this archaic system for another 4 years in my judgment raises serious doubts as to whether we ought to extend it at all. On the basis of the same plea I made in 1948—which I believe is just as applicable today—when the Senate by a vote of 47 to 33 changed a recommendation of the Armed Services Committee for a 5-year period to a 2-year period, I ask that the Senate cut down the committee's proposal of a 4-year extension to a 2-year extension.

I rest my case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and a distinguished soldier.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the senior Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, there are a number of reasons why the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be extended for the full 4 years as recommended by the committee.

We find ourselves currently engaged in one of the most crucial stages of our struggle with the forces of communism. The entire free world looks to the United States for a large portion of their protection from the Communist forces. Any show of weakness on our part, such as a failure to extend the draft or even a failure to enact a full 4-year extension, might be interpreted as a slackening in our defense effort and thereby cause irreparable harm to the solidarity of the free world.

It is true that with our present defense structure only a relatively few persons are actually inducted by the draft process. The number of inductees alone, however, is not a true indicator of the total effect of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Unquestionably, the very existence of the draft is a major stimulus for voluntary enlistments, and it is in this capacity that the Draft Act is so effective in providing our Armed Forces with needed personnel.

We all realize that there is a degree of inconvenience attached to any noncareer military service. Such service is, however, one of the responsibilities of a citizen of a democracy which goes hand in glove with the benefits of democracy. The benefits of a democracy cannot continue to exist unless the responsibilities are also met.

Neither the individual who undergoes military training in his youth nor the country will be harmed from the experience of service. On the contrary, both the individual and the country, aside from the defense issue, will benefit. Military training builds, not only good soldiers, but strong character and bodies, which will be of ultimate advantage to the individual who acquires them and to the country to whose benefit he applies them.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have given I am convinced that H.R. 2260 should be enacted in the form recommended by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last evening the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon placed in the RECORD

the proceedings in 1948 when the Senate considered reenactment of the draft. I note that fact to indicate that at that time I voted for a 2-year reenactment.

I wish to point out that conditions in the world today are vastly different from those that existed in 1948. At that time we were just beginning the period that has been so aptly described as the cold war. We had about 1.4 million men in the armed services, and this number was not regarded as adequate. We found it necessary to reinstate the selective service law in an attempt to bring the total up to about 2 million, as I recall. At that time we were still imbued with the hope that we could come to an understanding with the Soviet Government with regard to world conditions. There was still some hope by those who had not had any great experience with the Soviets that the Soviets might on occasion keep their pledged word and carry out their commitments.

Since that time we have found that it is characteristic of them not to discharge their commitments unless it is to their advantage to do so when the time of performance has come.

Therefore, Mr. President, today we must deal with a very dangerous and delicate situation in international relations. This situation revolves around Berlin. The Soviet Union has moved all over the space of the world. It has not been long since the danger point was in the Formosa Straits, on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Then they jumped with startling speed to the Middle East. There was trouble in Lebanon. We were compelled to send forces there in order to maintain our commitment. Then the trouble spot was moved from the Middle East to Berlin. Today Berlin is the focal point of conflict between international communism and the free world where there is respect for individual dignity. This conflict is centered in the capital of the old German nation.

There is a great deal more involved in the bill than the mere extension of the draft. It contains authority to extend for 4 years the ceilings on the Armed Forces. If the bill is not enacted it will be necessary on the 1st of July to reduce our military strength by about 500,000. Some 325,000 of that reduction will come in the Department of the Air Force, upon which we pin such vital hopes for our survival as a free people.

There are other provisions in the bill. To take care of the dependents of those who are in the Armed Services, and those provisions also would expire if the act were not extended. So much more, therefore, is involved in the bill than the extension of the draft.

We have had a great debate in the country—and it is manifest on the floor of the Senate every few days—about the size of military forces this Nation should maintain in order to make sure that we will be able to meet any threat anywhere on the globe.

Some of our most distinguished and learned military strategists have advised us that more ground forces are needed to maintain our position in Berlin. That demand has been voiced again and again

by Senators in this Chamber. Indeed, the Senate has voted to maintain the manpower at 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps for this fiscal year, and will undoubtedly vote to maintain that strength in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, in what position would we be if we haggled, quibbled, and squabbled here today about extending the draft for the 4 years requested by the administration? Congress would be saying, in effect, "We must have manpower to defend the country. The administration must acquire greater military strength." While we would be saying that in one voice, in another voice we would be saying, "We will extend the draft for only 2 years." We would be haggling and quibbling about the means to maintain the military strength we say is essential.

I am not a slave to consistency, but, in my opinion, it would be the height of inconsistency—almost puerile—for us to say that the military strength must be increased, while at the same time we placed drastic limitations on the only machinery which we know will provide the manpower necessary to maintain that strength.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. It should be defeated. It should be voted down. Let the word go out from this Chamber that the U.S. Senate means what it says when it asserts that the military strength of the United States must be maintained; and that, distasteful though it may be to extend any form of compulsory military service in this Republic, we realize that the draft is the only means by which our military strength can be maintained; therefore, we are extending the draft for 4 years and are saying to our associates in the free world, and, more than that, are saying to the men who are exercising the vast power of a tyrannical dictatorship in the Kremlin, that the United States of America means what it says.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time under the agreement been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two more minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Who controls that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senator from Georgia willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield back the time, if that is the only time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the vote will be on the Morse amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will be on the Morse amendment to extend the draft for 2 years instead of 4 years. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—24

Capehart	Humphrey	Mundt
Carroll	Langer	Murray
Case, S. Dak.	Magnuson	Neuberger
Church	Mansfield	Proxmire
Clark	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Dworshak	McGee	Wiley
Gruening	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—67

Aiken	Frear	Morton
Allott	Fulbright	Moss
Bartlett	Goldwater	Muskie
Beall	Green	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hartke	Pastore
Bible	Hayden	Prouty
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Bush	Hill	Robertson
Butler	Holland	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Scott
Cannon	Javits	Smathers
Carlson	Johnson Tex.	Smith
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Chavez	Jordan	Stennis
Cooper	Keating	Symington
Cotton	Kefauver	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kennedy	Thurmond
Dodd	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Long	Yarborough
Engle	McClellan	
Ervin	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Curtis	Hennings	
Ellender	Kerr	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks I have prepared with respect to the Draft Act extension

be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The remarks prepared by Mr. YARBOROUGH are as follows:

In a few minutes, I, like the great majority of the Members of the Senate, will vote for extension of the draft. It is a vote which I shall cast with some reluctance. But, with the obligation of economic and military leadership of the free world upon us, it appears to me that we have no alternative.

Khrushchev, with his ultimatum to us to abandon Berlin by May 27, has dealt a deadly hand of nuclear Russian roulette to all mankind. In this grave crisis, we could more seriously consider legislation to vastly increase our Armed Forces than we could to allow the draft to end.

Since the obligations and duties of leadership give us no choice but to extend this law compelling a period of military service for our qualified young men, I think we should consider carefully the result of our action.

The draft is a liability which has rested on our young men since 1940, excepting one minor gap, and if extended, will mean that a whole generation of American boys will be following their fathers into the draft lottery system. Who knows what changes this will mean in our national outlook and character, our traditional love of freedom and aversion to the unrestrained power of the military over the person?

Even as we pass this draft extension, I think we should be resolving to pass a new GI bill of rights for veterans of the seemingly endless cold war. The bill, S. 1138, which I have already had the privilege of introducing in cosponsorship with 25 members of the Senate, would not only restore to the boys we are going to draft, and their families, the lost opportunities resulting from their performance of this duty to our country, but also it would be to the very substantial benefit of the Nation in providing millions of more highly educated and trained citizens who would produce millions of additional revenues.

I believe that as we prepare to extend the draft law, we should also be thinking in terms of passing the cold war veterans GI bill, which I hope and expect will be before the Senate for consideration within a few weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—90

Alken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Bartlett	Green	Moss
Beall	Gruening	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Murray
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Bridges	Hayden	Neuberger
Bush	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Cannon	Humphrey	Randolph
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Javits	Russell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Scott
Chavez	Keating	Smathers
Church	Kefauver	Smith
Clark	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Talmadge
Dodd	McCarthy	Thurmond
Douglas	McClellan	Wiley
Dworshak	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Engle	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ervin	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Curtis	Hennings	
Ellender	Kerr	

So the bill (H.R. 2260) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 75, S. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 3, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "is" and insert "shall be"; in the same line, after the word "a", to strike out "law" and insert "provision of the Constitution"; in line 11, after the word "State", to insert "as provided in section 7, subsection (b) of this Act"; in line 20, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; in line 23, after the word "amendment", to strike out "or law,"; in line 24, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "It is further agreed that neither the State of Hawaii nor any subdivision thereof shall take any action or enact or enforce any law or regulation which imposes a tax, requirement or restriction which unreasonably discriminates directly or indirectly against nonresident persons, firms or corporations, their business, property, or occupational activities or opportunities."; in line 19, after "(a)", to insert "Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section"; in line 21, after the word "shall", to insert "succeed to the title of the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions in those lands and other properties in which the Territory and its subdivisions now hold title"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "have and retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be."; on page 5, line 15, after "(b)", to insert "Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section"; in line 16, after the words "United States", to strike out "hereby"; in line 17, after the word "upon", to strike out "the date of"; in line 18, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "absolute" and insert "United States"; in line 20, after the word "Hawaii", to strike out "as described herein,"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "in" and insert "held

by"; in the same line, after the word "to", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in line 22, after the word "admission", to strike out "of such State"; in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "Union," and insert "Union."; in the same line, after the amendment just above mentioned, to strike out "except as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall retain absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be. As used in this subsection, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded."; on page 6, line 13, after the word "The", to strike out "lands" and insert "grant"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "granted" and insert "made"; in line 17, after "(c)", to strike out "The lands granted to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom," and insert "Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be."; on page 7, after line 2, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(d) Any public lands or other public property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the 5 years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

After line 14, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(e) Within 5 years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

After line 22, to insert:

"(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section and public lands retained by the United States under subsections (c) and (d) and later conveyed to the State under subsection (e), together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands";

On page 8, line 20, after the word "under", to strike out "the preceding subsection" and insert "this Act"; after line 22, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(g) As used in this Act, the term "lands and other properties" includes public lands and other public property, and the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or properties so ceded.

On page 9, after line 5, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (e) of this section or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

After line 12, to strike out:

(d) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

At the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(i)"; at the beginning of line 21, to insert "and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 212, Eighty-third Congress, first session, 67 Stat. 462)"; on page 10, line 1, after "Sec. 6.", to strike out "Upon" and insert "As soon as possible after the"; in line 3, after the word "of", to insert "the Territory of"; in line 7, after the word "all", to insert "State"; in line 9, after the word "Hawaii", to insert "and for two Senators and one Representative in Congress. In the first election of Senators from said State the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No identification or designation of either of the two senatorial offices, however, shall refer to or be taken to refer to the term of that office, nor shall any such identification or designation in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators elected shall be assigned."; in line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "but the officers so elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said proposed State, said Representatives shall be elected at large."; in line 25, after the word "election", to strike out "not less than sixty nor more than ninety days after

said proclamation, and a general election shall take place within forty days after said primary election," and insert "and a general election"; on page 11, line 4, after the word "be", where it appears the second time, to insert "chosen by the people"; in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and officers for other elective offices provided for in the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may be, chosen by the people."; in line 17, after the word "be", to insert "either the primary or"; after line 22, to insert:

"(1) Shall Hawaii immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?"

At the beginning of line 25, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; in line 19, after the word "language" to insert "article XI shall be deemed to include the provisions of section 4 of this Act"; in line 22, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "second" and insert "third"; in line 23, after the word "other", to strike out "language." and insert "language, and section 10 of article XVI shall be deemed amended by inserting the words 'at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution and two Senators and one Representative in Congress shall be nominated and elected' in lieu of the words 'at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution shall be nominated and elected; but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives to the Congress, and unless and until otherwise required by law, said Representatives shall be elected at large'."; on page 13, line 11, after the word "shall", to strike out "thereupon"; on page 14, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "State" and insert "Territory"; in line 6, after the word "said", to strike out "State" and insert "Territory"; in line 7, after the word "Union", to insert "the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and"; in line 10, after the word "Congress", to strike out "from said Territory," and insert "thereof"; in line 17, after the word "in", to strike out "or"; in line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; on page 15, line 4, after the word "to", to strike out "two Representatives" and insert "one Representative"; in line 6, after the word "such", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; on page 16, line 9, after the word "amended", to strike out "to read as follows: '(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of eight years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.'" and insert "by striking out the words 'Hawaii and'. The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words 'Hawaii and', 'six and', and 'respectively.'"; on page 17, line 23, after the word "no", to in-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued March 13, 1959
For actions of March 12, 1959
86th-1st, No. 40

Adjournment.....9		
Area redevelopment3,13,30,33,55		
Budget.....17		
Budgeting.....47		
Buildings.....46		
Conservation.....22		
Contracts.....41		
Cotton.....32		
Cooperatives.....34		
Economic advisers.....8	Inflation.....23	Statehood.....10,27
Education.....54	Item veto.....47	Surplus commodities.....31
Electrification4,15,25,34,42,49	Military training.....11	Surplus property.....29
Employment.....22	Milk.....12,36	Textiles.....16
Extension work.....35	Monetary situation.....21	Tobacco.....39
Farm hearings.....18	National flower.....56	Trade fairs.....19
Farm program.....1,18,24	Nominations.....8	Trademark.....48
Fertilizer.....15,49	Patents.....43	Transportation.....37
Fisheries.....44	Personnel.....28,40	Turkeys.....45,51
Food radiation.....2	Price supports.....7,12,52	TVA.....15,25,49
Foreign affairs.....14	Public Law 480.....14	Unemployment compensation.....3,20
Foreign trade.....5	Reclamation.....42	Veterans' benefits.....26
Forestry.....6	Research.....30,50	Water compact.....38
Grains.....7,52	Science.....50	Water resources.....53
	Special milk.....36	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed Hawaiian statehood bill. Sen. Humphrey inserted Joseph Alsop's letter criticizing Secretary's farm policies. Sen. Humphrey and Rep. Coad introduced and Sen. Humphrey discussed turkey marketing bills. Rep. McGinley criticized USDA industrial uses research program. Rep. Poage criticized USDA barter regulations.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter to the editor by Joseph Alsop, "Mr. Alsop's Rejoinder to Mr. Benson," criticizing the Secretary's farm policies and contending that Congress had enacted most of the legislation the Secretary had requested to deal with the farm situation. pp. 3560-1
2. FOOD RADIATION. Sen. Church expressed his concern over increasing radioactivity in foods, urged an international atomic agreement "to halt this pollution of the atmosphere," and inserted two articles on the matter. pp. 3544-5
3. UNEMPLOYMENT. Sens. Byrd, W. Va., Randolph, and others discussed the unemployment situation and urged the enactment of area redevelopment legislation to help alleviate this situation. pp. 3569-74
Sens. Kennedy and Wiley expressed concern over the unemployment situation and urged the enactment of legislation to extend the temporary unemployment compensation program. pp. 3551-4, 3556-7

4. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger expressed his support for proposed legislation to amend the Bonneville Project Act so as to provide corporation-type management for Federal power operation in the Columbia River Basin, and inserted an editorial discussing the proposal. pp. 3543-4
5. FOREIGN TRADE. Sens. Bridges and Dirksen criticized the importation of Russian-made laboratory equipment for use in U. S. schools and colleges, and Sen. Bridges inserted two articles discussing this situation. pp. 3536-8
6. FORESTRY. Received a N. Mex. Legislature resolution opposing enactment of legislation to establish a national wilderness preservation system. pp. 3519-20
7. PRICE SUPPORTS: GRAINS. Received a N. Mex. Legislature resolution urging "the Secretary of Agriculture to correct administratively the discrimination against the high plains area of the United States with respect to the nominal price supports applied to agricultural production of grain sorghums in relation to preference given the midwestern area in the relatively high price supports applied to agricultural production of corn." p. 3520
8. NOMINATIONS. Confirmed the nomination of Karl Brandt to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. p. 3576
9. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 16. p. 3576

HOUSE

10. HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD. Passed, 323 to 89, without amendment S. 50, to provide Statehood for Hawaii. Rejected an amendment to extend the jurisdiction of Hawaii to other Pacific Islands. H. R. 4221, a similar bill, was laid on the table. This bill will be sent to the President. pp. 3578-3611
11. DRAFT EXTENSION. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 2260, to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training Act. The Senate amendments continued special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering the service after July 1, 1959. This bill will be sent to the President. p. 3577
12. MILK. Rep. Quie criticized the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association for asking Maryland "to further erect trade barriers in (the) State against the free flow of milk throughout the Nation" and urged enactment of a National Sanitation Standards Act for milk. p. 3578.
Rep. Hoeven inserted an announcement from Secretary Benson stating that current dollars-and-cents support prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat will be continued through the 1959-60 marketing year which begins on April 1. p. 3622
Rep. Quie commended the Secretary's announcement maintaining the present price support on milk. p. 3647
13. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Lane urged enactment of area redevelopment legislation pp. 3627-8
14. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Rep. Porter inserted figures on foreign aid to Spain since 1953, including aid under Public Law 480. pp. 3628-44
15. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Alger criticized TVA's fertilizer activities as being competition with private business. pp. 3644-5

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Alan J. Davis, North Royalton Methodist Church, North Royalton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of us all, to whom with confidence we turn for guidance and for strength, we thank Thee now for the countless blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us. Grant, O God, that we be not wasteful of them.

May we waste not the precious days Thou hast given us. Help us to do this day what needs most to be done.

May we in our deliberations waste not words. Enable us to use the gift of speech with truth and compassion.

May we in our work waste not the monies entrusted to our care. Guide us with wisdom and justice in their allocation.

And may we waste not the opportunities for leadership and service with which Thou hast honored us. May we have the moral courage to ever defend and work for that which is most pleasing to Thee.

Dear God, hear us as we pray, and be with us in our assemblies, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2260. An act to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 50. An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H.R. 2260, an act to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents As-

sistance Act of 1950, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1959' wherever such date appears therein and inserting 'July 1, 1963' in lieu thereof."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish the chairman would just explain what this amendment does.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amended the bill by adding to it a legislative proposal by the Department of Defense that continues eligibility for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1959.

In an attempt to procure more physicians and dentists, and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, there has been in effect for several years a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty are eligible for special pay of \$100 a month. Those with more than 2, but less than 6 years of service, are eligible for \$150. Those with more than 6, but less than 10 years of such service are eligible for \$200 a month. Those with more than 10 years may receive \$250 a month. Veterinarians are eligible for \$100 a month in special pay, regardless of length of service.

Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians already on active duty, or entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, would continue to receive this special pay, even if this amendment were not adopted. The amendment permits officers in these categories who enter on active duty between July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1963, to be eligible for these special payments in the same manner and amount that officers already on active duty are now receiving.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily am in accord with that, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order in connection with the Hawaiian statehood bill to consider the Senate bill in lieu of the bill H.R. 4221 and under the same terms and conditions of the special rule adopted yesterday in relation to the Hawaiian statehood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

JOINT MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1959, TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF IRELAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 18, 1959, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of Ireland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, roll call No. 9 on yesterday shows me as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate on the bill H.R. 4221.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. If it does not exceed 300 words. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

TRADE BARRIERS AGAINST FREE FLOW OF MILK

(Mr. QUIE was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, news that the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association is asking the Governor of Maryland to further erect trade barriers in his State against the free flow of milk from throughout the Nation is fresh evidence of the need of a National Sanitation Standards Act for milk.

For a long time, an effective blockade has been in force in the District of Columbia under the guise of arbitrary sanitation inspections. This action by the association shows that it wants to use every means at hand to further prevent distribution of milk which can qualify under any reasonable health inspection.

Many times in the past, Mr. Speaker, I have urged passage of the National Sanitation Standards Act—but this action by the association only reinforces the argument.

Passage of this act would put the distribution of milk on a fair basis—and would insure that the only barrier to entry of outside milk would be on an economic basis.

Considering present Washington, D.C. milk prices, it is evident that Minnesota milk can favorably compete on this basis. The class 1 price for milk delivered to plants in the Twin Cities of Minnesota is \$3.73 per hundred pounds in March. Any increased handling costs in preparing the milk for transportation to the District of Columbia would not be greater than 10 cents per hundred pounds. This fact was established conclusively by researchers at the University of Minnesota. Transportation costs to the District of Columbia would be \$1.80 per hundred pounds. This means that Minnesota milk can be delivered to Washington, D.C. from a Twin City Milk Producers Association plant for \$5.63 per hundred or 99 cents less than the present Washington price, a saving of better than 2 cents a quart to the consumer.

The need for a National Sanitation Standards Act was never more evident now that the Virginia-Maryland Milk Producers Association has decided on this step.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] had 1 hour and 44 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] 1 hour and 47 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I find myself somewhat in disagreement not only with my own committee chairman but with others on the committee reporting this bill. May I say in passing that we have a very fine chairman, and I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for the splendid job he is doing.

Mr. Chairman, I am realistic enough to realize that certain facts of life are very evident here and that this bill is going to pass.

I have opposed Hawaii statehood bills ever since I have been in Congress for a number of reasons, and I might state that at this time sitting in this Congress today are 165 Members who at one time or another have opposed statehood for Hawaii. The vote on yesterday indicated that not that many are opposed to statehood today. I merely say to those gentlemen either that they were wrong a few years ago or they are wrong now.

I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to direct a question or two to the gentleman from Colorado in order to satisfy the mind of the gentleman from Florida who has many misgivings about this bill. I direct the following question to the gentleman from Colorado: One of the things that is very disturbing to me in this proposed bill for statehood for Hawaii is the fact that the bill itself continues what I think has been a very inefficient organization or committee in the Hawaiian Islands, namely the Hawaiian Homes Commission. If the gentleman would enlighten me on that particular thing I would appreciate it. It is my understanding that the present bill under consideration will extend the life of the Hawaiian Homes Commission for a period at least of 99 years, is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will try to answer the gentleman's question as logically and as directly as I possibly can. I know the gentleman's feeling about this particular question and I have some sympathy with his position. On the other hand, I do not consider that it is a problem which we should resolve in deciding on the question of statehood.

Let me state that I cannot find myself in agreement with his statement in reference to the longevity of the Hawaiian Homes Commission which my colleague has just mentioned. It might be 99 years, it might be longer than 99 years. But it is provided in the act which created the Hawaiian Homes Commission

that loans granted shall be for a term of 99 years.

The purpose back of this originally was, of course, to give to the Hawaiian people of 50 percent or more Hawaiian blood the right to ownership and use of some of the land that was taken away from them when the treaty was originally made. It was taken away from them even though they had no ownership individually in the lands. The land was held by the Crown and the Crown having held the land at the time of Hawaii's inclusion into the United States it then became Territorial land. When it came into the Union it was then the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Territorial Government to administer the area.

What was attempted with the creation of the Commission was to provide for individual ownership of homes rather than the commercial approach which we have provided for the Indian tribes of the United States.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that the census of native Hawaiians in 1940 showed there were only 14,375 or 3.4 percent native Hawaiians.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Are we here going to create another situation similar to the situation we have created in regard to the American Indian, and what is going to be the responsibility of the people of America and this Congress to those people?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my opinion that we are not creating a similar condition to that which has brought about our Indian tribal communal ownership. It is my opinion also that as the years come and go, whether for 10, 50, or 100 years, this number which is slowly dwindling will become so negligible that this land will no longer be used for the purposes for which it is now administered by the Hawaiian Home Commission. When that time comes, then it will be up to the government of the State of Hawaii, providing the bill passes, with the consent of the Congress of the United States, to make such disposition of this land as is in the best interest of the people of Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that under the original organic act or the original act, approximately 400,000 acres of land was set aside to be used for the establishment of the people of Hawaii on their native land. Now, will it be the responsibility of the State of Hawaii to continue to hold that land make it available for the settlement of the people of Hawaii?

Mr. ASPINALL. If I understand the gentleman correctly, it will be the authority and the obligation of the State of Hawaii to hold this land for the people of Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I make one more statement, if my colleague will yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. In a measure I agree with his statement about the discharge of their duties by the members of the Hawaiian Home Commission. On the other hand, the law provides for a lease-

Public Law 86-4
86th Congress, H. R. 2260
March 23, 1959

AN ACT

73 Stat. 13.

To extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof. Draft extension,
etc.
69 Stat. 224.

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof. 10 USC app.
20j note.

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof. 69 Stat. 224.

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), is amended by striking out the words "July 1, 1959" and inserting the words "July 1, 1963" in place thereof. 50 USC app.
454 note.

SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1959" wherever such date appears therein and inserting "July 1, 1963" in lieu thereof. 69 Stat. 225.
37 USC 234.

Approved March 23, 1959.

3540 E